

# PAROXYSM OF CHAOS

2<sup>nd</sup> issue



*-Prologue -*

*Desecration of universality and the theatrical significance of civilisation's performances*

In the geographic area where I am (and not only) there is the need for defiance of the total mental and practical death that is surrounding us in the prison island by destroying ones socially constructed idol and penetrating in a battle which materially it is certain that it can't be won. By exchanging experiences and tools and taking full advantage however possible, not quitting even if you are kneeling from despair and create ruptures internally and externally with reality. A reality which has consolidated the trust for the police and the Law, the self repression founded in the social logic of "equality", snitches and "guard dog" citizens called the neighborhood watch, cameras even on the most stupid point anyone can imagine, the multi-culture with the morality of humanism and the "joy" of being a free citizen, the sacrifice of the desires of the individual on the altar of consumerism (mental and material), the ultimate domestication of the non-human animals who could be commercialized and the genocide of those who were a threat for the civilised human, thus transforming whatever land has been left into an almost sterilized landscape. Also creating nature reserves, prisons of the earthly environment but also the non-human individualities, which operate as the total ideologicalization of the control of Man over everything. The logic of ideologicalized imprisonment is implanted everywhere around us. But so is the logic of victimization.

An anarchist flow of life from a nihilist egoist point of view can be created even from one person. By individualities who move from the shadows into the shadows engaging in speech and action trying to actuate their own decivilized evolution inside a wandering of the unknown without a final purpose. Primary role has only the satisfaction of the self, the attempt for authentic relations with other animals, human, non-human but also the magnificent environments of the earthly fields outside of social interpretation, the consistency to no construct beyond being your own self and the pleasure of self-realization with all the means one has at his/her disposal, pushing every feeling and moment to the extremes. Against every civilisation and culture, acknowledging of course that your own elements have been created from somewhere, however going for the satisfaction of attacking every anthropocentric construct, which in the current era rules every human being and thus emerge even for a while outside the swamp of every human civilisation.

I think and act in my own personal way and not according to the ways of the rhetoricians of propaganda. My enemy is not whatever represents "authority", this ghost of most anarchists, in a sterile materialistic way or a "cleansing" from "bad" behaviors but anything that is a prison and dynast of my individuality. What enthrones a "must" and a Truth. Authority is internal and not external from the humans, when ideas create abstractions that demand from us something and this way it manifests itself in the real world. Authority is internalized standards. It is not the "evil" world that must be "exorcised" for the sake of universal "purity". The "world" doesn't interest me, it never did. The crusade against "authority" belongs to the soldiers of each ideology. I don't speak "anti-authoritarian"! I don't speak about equality between anarchist ideologies but about the complete destruction of ideology from its roots, which cannot be achieved in a world scale of course. I have fell into the trap of believing that someones did not think politically, like me, but I was wrong. It doesn't matter though, wrong conclusions can make you stronger if you don't leave yourself in the mercy of

dissapointment.

Capitalistic civilisation is the evolution of existence for those who perceived what is the mass and how to achieve the rise of their power. I am against them not because a christian anarchist morality tells me to annihilate "authority" from the face of the earth, but because inside this reality of control and domination of systems my individuality gasps for breath. Everyone wants to create zealots. Even anarchists, but when they see the poisons I hold inside of me for every carrier of ideological abstractions they become hostile. Because my filth messes up the purity of their morality and tears down the ethos of their civilisation. I am none of those things that everyone has conjured up in this world for the rupture of their universal void. Soldiers of the world I grant you your constructs. What interests me is inside the paroxysm of chaos to embrace the void actively ripping every "salvation" that depends on others or the recruitment of the individual for very well covered prophecies. My words and actions don't follow any "rationality", I understand the uncovered reality as a chaotic and pluralistic field. Yes I might be crazy and only the crazy ones understand me.

Therefore my struggle is against the systematization around me, to the point that concerns me regarding what I desire to conquer, to the extent of my power. This conquering doesn't happen in terms of control but with the release of desire from the strict confines of civilisation. From every morality, every culture, every ethos, every principle. Therefore every value that having taken transcendental substance manipulates the person. I begin the other way. The person creates the values as a chaotic game of exploration that can be of use to her to pass through each unique moment in existence. And not for creating an entrenched anti-reality of negation that would be nothing more than confinement in the recurring procedures of civilisation and thus the imprisonment of the individuality. With more reflection and experiences I conclude to realize that one ends up with moralism not only by not having deconstructed the meaning of society and thus trying to deconstruct the meaning of civilisation, but the opposite happens as well.

I notice that humanism is a major chain which connects automatically every subject to civilisation, as civilisation of the Human that it is, and doesn't leave a person to throw away from him every system that imprisons the ego in recurring procedures just with different axiological prefix. If any revolutionaries start condemning me with claims such as "This civilisation is not of the Human but of Profit and the authority coming from it". Yes dear priests this is nothing but a little sand in the desert of what civilisation really is. Under which ideologeme where all these that we despise (for different reasons) created? Under the ideologeme of Human and its Freedom, therefore its "progress", its prosperity that everyone should comply to. Which was the first ideologeme that followed all others I don't know, who cares anyway in a reality constructed on abstractions, but you still want to reveal the "true" Human, not the one that they claimed but another one that will bring "total freedom". How beautifully the mind connects its reified concepts! By being Human and uniting on the basis of this will True Freedom flourish "one day", this holy day that we sacrifice ourselves to see before our eyes. And by being Anarchist (a role and essentiality) with its ethos and its own civilisation you "unlock" the Human and its "qualities". The self? Is this something that matters? No this is petty in front of the Big Ideas. This concept cannot be connected to revolution, it will always undermine it. Only as an identity of revolution, as a self subjected to a role can it be of use to it and subconsciously connect "the individual" to it. By becoming The Role subconsciously you "eliminate" the

contradictions of being a puppet of something else. The ego and its desires cannot incarnate the Human, the Anarchist, because the former are too imperfect, they have to be sacrificed for ideologies to be created that unite for "change", for something surely "better" for all of "us". The "right" ideas do not bring slavery of course! How many anarchists have now become the true priests of the True Human which can be achieved through specific ideas and behaviors? Politics and ideology show their true face only when you are looking from the outside. When you are not concerned with "comrades". The anarchist nihilist uses anarchy and never the other way. What politics creates is the vehicle for well hidden ideological propaganda and the perpetuation of someones' own dogmatic agenda. After the death of God, political involvement, movements and ideological agendas became the new religion for not discarding objectivity, for maintaining the belief in a new True World, for making the self feel significant again in the eyes of Existence, because when reality crushes you, you leave "things" to be handled by your Spirit, which wants to take over and fantasize its own reality of belonging and universality, when it cannot anymore provide meaning from the self when left naked in the physical unknown. Most anarchists supposedly "atheists" have just replaced one idol with another, they are trying to retrieve God (the Human) by following their sacred ideals.

If the person doesn't realize that he creates his values by exploring, but instead he internalizes those as an unquestionable guide of behavior and discovery of Truth, then this person and the rest who will unite on the basis of values that consolidated internally new systems are carriers of new authority, first of all over his own self and afterwards by becoming a transmitter of peremptory shit of his own Truth, therefore morality and ideology which automatically seek receivers to be realized, namely, soldiers, self-immolative ones and generally those who internalize transcendental abstractions as values and see them as sanctities and not as tools. Desire has absolutely no relation to the observance and propagandism of values. This desire is determined by internalized systematization. Desire can only be unfold with the as much as possible self-determined denial of civilisation and then each one of us maybe will see her existence not as a tool of values but the opposite, and herself as a unique being that enjoys chaos without trying to "exorcise" ghosts by using other ghosts. To me concepts are toys whereas for others they are whole worlds and castles out of nowhere. The universal "majesty" crushes the individuality and doesn't leave her to perceive that her universe is only her and part of it are what she has conquered through non-systematized relations and the overcoming of alienation. Where are these individualities I wonder? The terrifying egos who extort their individuality from the dungeons of the perpetual universality where the ghosts imprisoned them?

It is hedonistic and libertine to go stark naked with an axe in hand even alone if necessary to besiege castles. How many meanings and identities can be given to this by civilisation little does it interest me. The only thing that interests me is the terrifying feelings of self-realization this offers. I don't fight authority in the name of Anarchy, but just for myself. For me an abstraction named anarchy doesn't describe what authority is, only I do. Inside these confines anarchy could be only a dynast of my ego, so in this sense fuck this anarchy. Freedom means my ego to use everything and not the concepts-worlds, products of reification to use my ego. As time passes I conclude to the comprehension that all the extremely opposites are only seemingly so. Whoever I reject I don't do it because I am their "exact opposite", but because I don't like them or because there are axiological obstacles that cannot be overcome, it is a matter of choice in an aftermath of events. The whole

"world" and human thinking is built on binaries and the systematized thinking. Though prejudice and binaries go hand in hand and they are all products of systematized thinking, of ideology. My nihilism is hostile towards these logics because they present an ideological anarchist ethos. A culture that the individuality must adopt in order to conquer the role of the anarchist inside the society of anarchist civilisation. The ideological culture means morals and customs, it means institutionalization of behaviors inside political confines. It is as I see it another strong set of chains over the individuality. The most difficult thing in today's era is to have your own content, to not be defined by anything, so yourself to be a world that although it has been created by this world and it is still part of it, it doesn't exist anywhere else. I don't speak of a new ideal here but of the theory and action that never detaches from the experiences and by extension the desires and the will of the self as it evolves from them.

The human that creates the Human is my enemy because he is creator of stupefying ghosts, creator of universality and objective meaning of existence, blind in front of the chaos of the flow of life and creator of systems for the realization of the imaginary essence and the cause of Existence. Creator of ghosts which so much faith and blood that has been given on their altar they acquired real flesh and bones. The Human, this mythological essence of the contemporary civilisation, mainstay of ideologies that build the societies of slaves, is necessary to be destroyed if one wants to rise, from the black crypts where the anthropocentric thought imprisoned it, the autonomous free individuality. The iconoclastic determination of the ego. Human is just a word that indicates biological characteristics only. The figuration of the icon of the Human as anything (something specific) is just a mask of civilized cultural and social constructions which creates Humanity, the ultimate chain, and uses it as pillar of ideologies. The leprosy of personal consciousness, of the individuality who seeks to fulfill his desires through his uniqueness. The same can happen with any concept, even the anarchist. Let every icon become ashes inside of us if we want to traverse the world as individualities and not as rags of various identities. Many create their own castles, but I walk as a passer by not belonging to any faction and I spit on everything that shows paths. I care to reveal chaos and not promote "my shit". The wager is whoever reads these words to expropriate them and make them his, destroying them in the process. Ignoring whoever wrote them, because there is no God, only ones ego. Though the ego is not a product that you buy or a lesson that you get a degree in.

Listen to me carefully! No one will ever free the non-human animals, no one will expropriate the earthly environment from civilisation and most of all no one will ever live in a world of idealized human freedom. Total Freedom is a rotten ideal that chaotic existence spits on it. My freedom is the here and now. If I don't fight for it, for who I am or what else I might discover about me tomorrow then I am already dead or a lover of the systematization that human mind is fond of producing. Having developed your own critique and content is something necessary for me if someone wants to act as a unique self and not as a rag of institutionalized thinking that comes from values in themselves. Action is not a sacred that unites and if it doesn't have content or the content is as I mentioned before it is just a product for the consumers of pre-served thinking. The reified meanings of axiologically objective products in words used to justify actions in communiques and elevate the perpetrators into the theatre of significance of spectacularized manichean battles is a pit of imprisoning revolutionism, where the puppets of the sacred ideas become the bearers of their non

existent idols' holy vengeance upon the "common enemy". To be a transmitter of a thousand times regurgitated ideals doesn't make you anything but a soldier who follows heroes in an attempt to steal some of the light of the futile tendencies of the Overhuman.

*"I live in a world of performances,  
why are humans harlequins?  
the theatre has now become the whole earth,  
how can you deny your role?"*



### ***Chaotic iconoclasm and incineration of idols (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 1)***

For me chaos already exists. It has always been around us because it is the flow of life. If seen otherwise it would have been a ghost of one's own doing trying to consolidate it as a reified "situation" or "being" instead of living each different moment of chaos revealed from the realization of ones desires with as much power as possible getting the most out of it and realizing that nothing which actually lives or the flow of events is not monolithic and will never be. This is the interpretation of civilisation not of conscious, living for the now individuals. In my opinion, from the moment you think that you live for the purpose of existence, you have denied chaos. Chaos could be neither order nor disorder. It doesn't imply a natural or artificial state. It is the unknown of

possibilities and the flow of life itself. It could never take the meaning of absoluteness because it is not monolithic. It is an abstract term which if we see as an anticipated "thing" it can easily become an ideal. To disclose moments of chaos you need to be only loyal to yourself and incinerate every civilised interpretation of reality. Chaos could easily become a ghost like the term of freedom. One hunts the ghost of freedom and another of chaos, with the meaning of the exact opposite of the imposed order. How civilised would then the perception of chaos be? The chaotic is not interested in any binaries because inside these he sees chains. Every ideology of civilized perception including most of the anarchists defines its "opposite" so as to be able to construct itself supposedly without contradiction in whichever aspect of existence. What I seek is the unlocking of chaos by transcending the total oblivion that civilisation has imposed on the will to realize ones own desires by extorting them from channeling into ghosts. In short civilisation is not the opposite of chaos but its camouflage. Chaotic are the moments that have been created by ones personal will in accordance to an unchained to external factors conscience whereas civilised life is habit, following rules for "co-existence" or destruction of "the enemy" and swimming into the swamp of alienation from directly lived experience. Civilisation is part of the chaos of existence but it is not chaotic living, acting to experience life in existence rather than living for the purpose of existence. Chaos through my thinking is the destruction of existence as universality. The nihilistic interpretation of reality in the physical world.

Civilisation has been created by real natural beings. But I am not a preacher of the natural so as to justify civilisation and accept its chains. This is why I spit on every rationalist thinking that justifies something just because it perceived its origin as much as I spit on every myopic thinking that presents something as something that it is not only to set the pillars for their ideologies. Civilisation is nonetheless the monolith that comes to be nailed inside the head of every individuality and make it repeat procedures that have been taught and stop having a will to discover other possibilities. It transforms it in a carrier of monolithism, of cultural confines in ones personal interactions, or what I would say "order" or "classification" when confronted with the physical reality. This is also another reason why I am a misanthropist, because I hate the most of the consolidations coming from the creations that these natural beings have created throughout the historical years. My perception included in my experiences has burned every "salvation" there is to be found for the human being to disclose its "true identity". Whether it is the quest for the "natural" or for whichever model of "human" I raise my contempt and my iconoclastic sincerity of both critical thought but also sarcastic indifference against every not only ghost, but for their creators as well. The carriers of every ideal that comes to show me the way and eliminate my individuality. My will to continue experiencing chaos. Human beings are natural, they have always been and there is no external force that compells them to do things, they create the external forces to justify their actions, their fear, their subordination and never accept responsibility for their pluralist nature which in its purest form it is no other than the chaotic will that bursts out of a fully conscious for its monosignificant existence desiring individual. In this pluralist nature of course is included the sickly clinging to ghosts that are seen as more real than the persons themselves. I am not pretending that these ghosts haven't become real and consuming individualities until they spit their last bone but I really don't care. I don't care for the ending of one who isn't strong or doesn't want to defy every ghost and I don't care what would have happened if these consolidated external forces supposedly didn't exist because as I



said before these were created by natural beings and still other natural beings follow them even if they are not the creators of those themselves they will create their own out of these. So I hate all of them because they represent obstacles in the realization of my desires. All these you see around you as artificial are for me natural. Domination is natural, technology is natural, humans are natural, civilization is natural. The meaning of nature the way I use it here has nothing to do with morality neither does it justify anything of the above through ideologicalization. It takes the meaning of relations and situations that have been created by the interaction between real entities inside the historical years. The only thing that could stand as artificial would be anything that doesn't exist in the physical world. In no case does this imply that cognition and the sphere of thought are not natural, just that the only thing which could be seen as artificial from my point of view is whatever exists only inside the sphere of thought and maintained as real although without having physical substance but acting as such, acting as an entity. All abstractions could be seen as artificial. This -in a way- separation that I make here could help in the destruction of the depersonalisation of the real entities due to the chains of reification created by civilization, by language, by culture. Artificial is so to say contexts of ideology, morality and religion from my point of view. Though the lines are slim and many times not very distinct at all. Because morality and ideology for many humans are parts of their own reality and they acquire substance in the physical world. In essence the binary natural - artificial is just another categorisation of the civilised world onto parts of chaos. Which when they are drenched and baptized morally they transform into dogmatic chains and mental suicide. Of course there isn't any "unnatural" situation for me, neither behavior nor creation. What I accept or what I don't tolerate comes directly from my egoist conscience with regards to my reality and my experiences which create my values. What concerns me is to extort the will from the channeling into external forces which desire an object, an ideal and turn it towards desire to act for ones own interests. I have said again from my point of view Nature is another ghost of "essentiality", which always takes the meaning of the dogmatically specific which is categorized as either "inherently good" or "inherently evil" depending on the point of view and aspirations of each morality and ideology. Nature is not synonymous with a pre-existent of man "wildness". It is not a homogenized entity outside of the humans. It is not the "human essence" which lost the "right path" with the rise of "authority" and now it tries to "atone" with the return to "nature" and find the harmony of "equality". The fairytales of the lobotomized, alienated ecologists or various eco-anarchists, primitivists just make me laugh and hate even more. The worlds of tomorrow from my nihilist point of view are buried deep in the tombs of imaginary Humanity. Wildness as I use it is the attempts of the self to stand against every civilisation with all the meanings it takes. The wager is for one to win in the now the relations he/she desires with whatever they feel attracted and love for their own reasons. Simultaneously with attacking according to ones power all obstacles that confine them from being who they are and fulfilling their desires. I was and still am enthusiastic with the parts of the world that at least used to not have been created by humans (which sometimes now are because of the sterility after so many years of capitalist industrial devastation), as well as with the non-human personalities that I have been in contact and always search for the discovery of more, most of the times in vain (although it still surprises me what can happen sometimes) but without surrender, I, a seed of civilisation but at the same time its cancer, deny to obfuscate my eyes with the sickness of massification which possesses the minds but also the bodies of the modern alienated humans. Humans always created civilisations to survive against other forces but also predators which were



once stronger than them. The problem is that humans with the ability of systematized thought and the forms it takes in the physical world in the end create a world-prison, the world of sterilisation, of destruction of uniqueness, the world of the supposedly universally significant soldiers of Humanity (and its little comrades, Nations, roles of Society) that regulate and control, although in my eyes this weakness imprisons a beautiful and vital flow of life in favor of the causes that are not ones own. Of reified entities created from abstractions. Whether it is the cause of Existence, Profit, Progress, Freedom, Anarchy, Nature in the end it remains the same. What is ones own cause then? From my point of view it could be nothing less than living or dying to unfold your inner desires and reap the satisfaction of fulfilling their content. Whoever doesn't understand the difference between this and ideology might better have to think if their own desires and consciousness have been consumed by an external conscience.



***The coronation of moralism upon the throne of the ghost of Nature  
(Anticivilisation paroxysm part 2)***

There is an ideology which has been rising lately due to the effects of the putrid modern technology and the catastrophic effects of the techno industrial complex on the earthly environment and every individuality. People who instead of using their experiences of war as a real weapon they convert them into pure self-righteous moralism, "descriptive" yet still abstract dualism with metaphysical references, religious mysticism, the subordination of the ego before the "goodness" and the "righteousness" of the "natural" and of course the absolute denial of chaotic existence, namely of

the perception (which tries to negate the human alienation and monolithism by re-appropriating relations from nothing, from the self) that the world around us is relations ever changing and never stagnant between anyone and anything and cannot be categorized in two worlds, which accepts that the mind of a single being will never be able to categorise environments and beings that hasn't come in contact with or experienced itself with one term, but also at the same time never accept a notion of feeling worthless of engaging with the world because "it cannot possibly perceive it". Yes nobody will ever be able to possibly perceive the physical existence completely or give answers at all if any, but who cares? This preaching doesn't help at all in the negation of homogenization of life and the monolithism of human alienation which is one of the basic pillars of the modern civilisation. I will be clear here. The major problem starts from the completely different perceptions about what civilisation is in its core. Also major collision of values comes from my rejection of metaphysical thinking and idealistic rationalism as I see them as complete chains in re-appropriating your life in the now with as much power as you have, forming your own relations to everything around you and destroying every reasonable systematic way of thinking which gives you "clues" and guidance about existence.

In this text I attack the ideas and the justification of these people and not their practises, this has to be made clear. I don't have any problem with whoever consciously has chosen not to care about the humans they don't know and thus not restrict the desire to act beyond the moral civilised naivety of "guilty - innocent" which is clearly a social narrative that almost every anarchist falls into the trap of reproducing. Although it is really questionable for me whether in the case of the eco-extremists it is a choice of living as a chaotic being (which can take possibly infinite forms) or an obligation towards realizing their ideologemes. I personally think it is the second. There is a major chasm between the two. I do not question them as warriors against a crushing majority of compliance into the swamp of belonging but I oppose their externally received systematic values which become chains over ones ego.

The representatives of eco-extremism are within my way of thinking only when they say that the logics of killing "innocents" are civilised logics and I would also add political logics, logics of camps that I resent and have nothing to do with reality when you see yourself alone in the universe and not belonging morally in a unity. Although a distinction needs to be made. I don't care at all about a binary of "discriminate" or "indiscriminate" violence. Both can be moralistic respectively in their own ways. Violence does not have a "name". Violence is an inextricable part of the affirmation of life in the chaotic existence and whoever denies it is either denying life by living in fairytales, or whoever uses it as a justification for moralistic thinking that comes from ideological consciences is for me another of the many carriers throughout history of their own "sacred flames". Of the ghost with the so many faces. Of Truth. The thing is where does one spend violence and how they explain it within their uniqueness in order for me to agree or disagree. The problem of most anarchists is the deep morality of the value of life in itself (the state of existing), thus taking a life is justified only through politics strictly ideologicalized being carriers of the morality of life. I'm not speaking about everyone I think this is clear. There isn't a direct and sincere explanation that we just killed or attempted to kill because we are enemies and we were happy to do so or even because we don't care about whoever is an obstacle in the realization of our desires. Within these contexts there would be many differences and I could understand many, but I would agree and support those that aim at the

annihilation of authoritarian structures. Am I justifying actions now, because I am implying that I support a reified anti-authoritarianism? No of course not. This is what most anarchists do. I have my own perception about what authority (this abstract term) is and where it gestates itself. I feel close affinity only with those who act from themselves for themselves and not in the name of anything "higher" than them. My chaotic perception doesn't leave space for "fairness" and has eradicated the ghost of Justice from wherever it comes from. By saying this I don't mean I agree with whoever leaves explosives at random building entrances in order to kill randomly spreading the morality of anti-ethics, which is supposedly perceived as amorality, because this is another prescription to achieve nihilism at its "highest level" making it a dogmatic ideology of destroying all values only to stay there imperatively. This is something that will be analyzed later. On the other hand I have nothing to do with pathetic humanist anarchists who bomb malls but state that they would prefer even to risk their own lives in order not to hurt anybody in the process of carrying out an attack. So these direct ways of thinking I mentioned before are the only context that I understand and not the political that try to create a profile of a systematic ethos. For me the anti-heroic insurrected individualist (in a sense beyond a compulsory conflict of bravery and cowardice not fetishizing any of those, without meaning an anti-hero role), in the eyes of the herd mentality masses, is a monster and one who is "wrong" to exist on the earth. Even a coward to others, who doesn't want to fight for "the cause". If every killing, or even an attempt that happens is deeply done under the banners of one of the major ghosts perceived from the depths of the tombs of saint Humanity, named Justice, then it becomes a sacrifice not a destruction of an obstacle which affirms life, but on the contrary it praises death. In my eyes this is a religious practice. Of course I will show in this text that religious justification of a practice can originate from the camps which will be criticized here too. There are only few anarchists, nihilists who even if they know they might create mud in a swamp at least they do it for themselves, they don't try to change nor do they accept this world. Not even try to be parts of the most appealing to the "extremes" culture of the current era. As it has always been after the elimination and control of anything that posed a threat over the humans, the real dimension of the matter, which is so concealed in the contemporary era because of egalitarian ghosts, is human against human. Which if you deeply scratch the surface especially in the modern reality it is ideology against ideology which makes things sometimes fanatic, or others just myopic wars between enslaved beings, both being pathetic and very far away from a sincere perception of the war of all against all and the beautiful relations it might bring for the unchained individualities who dive into it. There are no other powers in rivalry, because everything else has been domesticated physically. Well humans included of course but since the development of their skills has surpassed every other form of being the war remains there. Though there are still the neverending interactions between different beings and environments which will always play a significant part in the ongoing change regarding the flow of life. Having clarified these I continue with the criticism of this text.

Because my perception of the war against every chain (not authority as a reified concept, but only through personal perception) could be no less critical to those who spread the domination of the Natural over the individual ego, by using a reified Ego with specific characteristics (for the true ones) and come as carriers of the flame of dogmatic smite upon the "guilty for being unnatural", having to carry out their orders from the metaphysical voices of Nature which is the reified Unknown (not the unknown as I perceive it through the moments that chaotic outbreaks gestate new possibilities), the

metaphysical abstraction of a world which is completely separated from the human consciousness and which the human consciousness is completely worthless of conceiving its "nature". The logic of the "human observer" and judge who punishes (these people have used the word many times) is an absolute moralistic attitude outside of any context, drowning into superstition, prejudice and an attitude that denies the beauty of the unlimited chaotic beings and their unique wills (when they are in control of their own conscience while continuously striving to eradicate alienation) as well as the variety of environments and thus perpetuating the separation that civilisation imposed. The fake separation of Civilisation - Nature. And in the process, finding the ideal culture that will supposedly unite the two "essences" of "human" and "nature" into one as it "should be". Some who oppose civilisation now (at least what they perceive as such) but haven't been able to overthrow ideology and morality due to the same alienating processes that civilisation brings upon everyone, make a longing for the return to the ghost of the Natural as the moralistic flagellation to the "unworthy" person who belongs to the human species to perceive whatever is outside of him/her, the realm of Nature, wanting to become "cleansed" and the exact opposite from the "impurity" of the supposedly fully perceived for what it is civilisation. They forget that beings from the human species once, before the rise of modernity had created civilisations of their own by trying to overthrow with their inborn thought and constantly developing skills through their interactions, the alienation that had been imposed upon them by the supposed "higher entities" than them at that time or even other animals who were tearing them apart. But now here come the universal judges ready to prepare the throne for the return of the "goddess", which they actually call "HER". Complete anthropomorphism originating from anthropocentric perceptions and a reference that is clearly religious and ideological. Thus whatever is human made stands for "artificial" and whatever is outside of the human is the monolithic alive goddess of "nature". Ascribing intrinsic value to the "good" things in life, the "things in themselves" which are there for their own (I am beyond this metaphysical rhetoric, I don't care what they are there for, but only to re-appraise my relations to them, seeing nothing as sacred including the human of course) and the person who belongs to the human species must bow in humility in front of them. There is no debate for me between ascribing axiological priority to the construct of the "human" or the construct of "nature". The "human" construct (either seen as a moral pillar or as worthless) is the one that guarantees our interpretation of everything around us through anthropocentric perceptions. The "natural" construct creates the "unknown" as the revelation of "truth", a "truth" that human minds created, still a completely anthropocentric perception. In front of the somehow perceived by these people "unknownness" of the ghost of the Unknown, the noumenal world arises as a sanctity, everything that has consciousness is a "maggot" unworthy of the ghost of Truth. Dualistic and idealistic, stinking dogmas that remind rotting corpses like Kant. The superficial ideological egoism that ascribes inherent value to the universe (a substitute for the respective inherent value in Man as the "centre" and subject of "progress") is a religion. It presents the person as a humble tool that has to find "its place" in front of the unexplainable universe, a servant bowing to the "holy natural" existence. Prophecies of who will last and who won't, defeatism which is taken for pessimism and determinism camouflaged as misanthropism which is actually an ideological monster of prejudice, of inability to go beyond and create your life, thus remaining entrapped in the dialectics of metaphysics and authoritarian ghosts. Even as descriptive terms without suggesting human separateness, they are so limited and describe the world as two opposing forces, disregarding the unlimited interactions between beings and

environments that form the existence of life. Even as descriptive it encloses the world in boxes of reified content and still continues the narrative of civilisation. It is entrapped in the dialectics that are imposed as authority over the person. It doesn't go beyond in discarding the civilised roots in our minds and try to find personal ways of decivilising without prescriptions or a "bigger purpose" but it engages in the "eternal war" of manichean battles. What would otherwise "defend ourselves from the artificial" mean? Progress is seen as quantitative advancements which take us away from the "natural" and not simply as an empty ideologue to support the complete justification of the systems of domination, which have become extremely concrete in the physical world. Thus a concept that needs to be discarded and seen as non-existent so as to destroy the past - future relationship and go beyond to live for the now, never to alienate the self with the "righteousness" of the past or try to reverse/stop the damage with prophecies about the future. This moralistic ideology has nothing to do with the destruction of systematization that civilisation imposes on every egoistic individuality. The ghost of Progress as an offspring of the ghost of the Human needs to be combated through each unique ego and not through a construct of Nature which opposes the supposed "artificiality" of the human activities to justify actions. Constructs of "human" and "nature" are complementary with each other. Simply as I see it whoever sees themselves as protectors or vigilantes because whichever "nature" has been wronged is still an anthropocentrist in the cases which I describe in this text or a carrier of various moral prejudices in other cases.

I have nothing to do with the anarchists who supported them because of an adherence to guerillaism and of course every rotten revolutionary perspective (in contrast to some others much more honest who never supported them because of the theoretical content) and then after the so called "indiscriminate" attacks were "revealed" (they were mostly clear from the start) they stopped as blindfolded priests of their dogmatic moral values. All this time their theoretical content was "ok"? Did it seem at first that they were fighting for a "good cause" that could benefit the ghost of Anarchy? Although revolutionism for me is not only the attempts to overthrow value systems only to establish your own. It is also the imaginary or political unions for achieving any kind of goals. The imaginary is when people read a communique and because of the ultimate chains of language they immediately perceive it as "an affinity" whereas even if similarities exist regarding targets the perception and values collide. The political is when multiple theories (mostly ideological) maintain the same major ghosts as references of reified enemies or as causes and goals. I also wonder how the topic of moralism hasn't been criticized yet. It seems it is because none of these people understand what morality is because when you uphold an ideology morality follows nonetheless. The same happens with religion. Morality is usually inextricably connected to ideology which is consciousness taken from anywhere else but the own self, because morality is systems of values which have been adopted by an external consciousness, an "entity" product of reification and dictate perceptions about the world outside of the person, as well as ways of confronting life always justified by the ideologicalization of the "source", the provider of values. Morality is a logic which confines the ego in binaries, in superstition and prejudice, in myopic perception and as such it is suppression of possibilities and of free from "an esoteric god" desires. It is like you don't want to experience the world from oneself trying to overthrow every toxin of the mind, but instead one wants to categorize the world in various divisions instead of trying to conquer anything you can enjoy and destroy all obstacles in your way which don't allow you to do so and not condemn anything from an ideal, or

deterministic metaphysics, or enthrone anything as sacred.

To be able to perceive better the dualistic logic that accompanies the eco-extremists one has to think the following: Morality is seen as whatever has to do with taking into account the lives of other humans generally. Thus what is seen as "immoral" from the majority of the contemporary civilised ones bound by society, is embraced by the eco-extremists as "rejection of morality", which is either a horrid delusion or masking (at least an effort) of the hyper dogmatic character of their analyses. Namely, to kill everybody is the "answer" to the morality of intrinsic values of the enthusiasts of the human species. Another manifestation of morality, of the dualistic logic that originates from the swamp of Justice, here are being judged the enemies of the ghost of Nature and the judges are the eco-extremists. Accused is everybody except for the enlightened ones that undertook "Her" task. Paradoxically this tries to be named as an egoistic cause, and not that it isn't, but the egoist is somebody else here, the Wild Nature, an abstract "entity" and content, a non-existent imaginary egoist, which is the "content" of the eco-extremists. The social logics are reproduced in whole here because humans are still seen through their roles, whoever works is a "worker", whoever works in a university is a "progressivist", whoever exists in a city is a "citizen". And I'm not saying that so many times these are not valid, namely that whoever is under the condition of a socially given role does not adopt it and reproduce it as an essential identity and duty, but a moralistic logic like this doesn't help with anything beyond the fact it doesn't deconstruct society at all, it just reproduces it as a whole by seeing existent entities as roles and not as some who are criticized from personal perspectives for their real actions and choices and not for anything imaginary that only their role represents. I wonder how many roles have been given by society during their lives or even in the present to the representatives of eco-extremism? Do they consider themselves part of them? Do they consider themselves "guilty" in front of the idol of Nature? Of course when society is seen as a mass of humans as a final perception no one can expect perceptions that deconstruct it without creating another morality and imprisoning their carriers in eternal moral prejudices. When the effect is seen as the cause then this is what is created. The differences between the eco-extremists and the communists or any other ideological radical perceptions are much less than in comparison to my anti-social perception, because they aim once more at how to manage the masses instead of transcending them. This time these people come with a really revolutionary idea. To annihilate them!

Inside all these frames of adoption of the morality of death nihilism is not just a tool of sarcastic or sardonic analysis of reality around the person and a tool of tearing down all moral values that is used to assist the person to evolve itself towards the direction he/she has set because of their own desires. This is anarchist nihilism when it has not been ideologicalized as unfortunately is done by many anarchists which I won't analyze now. Regarding some who find affinity with the eco-extremists now, my nihilism is not the destruction of all values and of knowledge converting the void itself into a sacred. Thus creating another ideology with an anti- ideological mantle. Creating the faith in Nothing as the revelation of Truth. The voidance, the emptying of the ego from ideological and moralistic sanctities of society and civilisation, namely this that I see as nothing, if it isn't creative then it is converted to a priest of revelation of yet another dogmatic existential state. Therefore the rejection of personal axiological knowledge is a delusion and in no case does it render amorality but the morality of anti-ethics. The same happens with the binary "discriminate" vs "indiscriminate".

Amoralism has in no case any relation to preconceived particularly specified choices or practises. It is primarily a mental attitude of rejection of every dualism of morality that creates camps wherever it might be emerging from. The delusion that if you are the exact opposite of what ostensibly society and civilisation seem to be doesn't make you an amoralist but a real moralist with an "amoralist" mantle. The problems start from what seemingly each society presents as its product and thus the one that wants to be named antisocial falls into the trap of adopting the exact opposite so as to be "right" and falls into moralism. For example if society sells products of equality and tolerance then to be a nihilist and antisocial you will "have to" hate respect (I'm not speaking about a respect rooted in the mind by an idea), a mutual understanding or relation that might develop between egos (they will always have to be competing), comprehension of different perspectives (I see all of these from an egoist point of view with the self as the centre of understanding). If on the other hand the mass (called again society as the final definition of the term) seems "indifferent" for the "world" and for the cause of the individual as he/she has idealized it in their heads then to be a nihilist and antisocial means to sanctify "negation", namely, the purification and the exact opposite from what seemingly constitutes society, including hatching a correct humanism inside of you. I believe it is easier now for someone to comprehend what I mean but also the nature of moralism which is an inextricable part of authoritarian logics. To be an amoralist doesn't contain the imperative, final choice between wanting to annihilate all the humans or not. Morality doesn't have to do only with what originates from the dominant social norms. Morality is always connected to the rigid oppositions. And another thing I would like to mention before the end of this paragraph. The logics of acceptance of authority and domination that it creates and finally their reproduction with egoistic prefix, like for instance the ideologeme of egoarchism, is another type of idealistic theory with purpose the supposed transcendence of contradictions that creates the contemporary mass of social reality. Although things are much more deep and there are no easy answers. The ego for dominating over authoritarian bonds needs to become itself, a person (which doesn't guarantee specific qualities) not an imaginary Ego, neither ideologicalize reality. The ideologeme of egoarchism doesn't distinguish the relations of power from the relations of domination and it is there where the problem of perceptibility is, when it comes to authority. From everyone. From anarchists and from "archists". Almost all anarchists see relations of power as the "evil" and the problem, whereas the latter confuse the two completely different types of relations thus ideologicalizing domination. As not to fool ourselves here as some idealists, authority will never be completely destroyed (from the world), as it is originating from the human minds (therefore many of these creations will standardize domination), we could say for example that reality itself, could be seen as authority, which you can never overcome and which (reality) is something that I take into account in my considerations and practises. Although this can lead to another idealistic perception in which if you can't enjoy anything perceived from the senses you end up barricading yourself into the illusions of your own mind. Or in other cases end up seeing conscience as something separate from the person. But when you analyze it in the exact same way as the mass man, nothing else is expected. Conscience for me comes from a vivid consciousness, not from corpses of morality and it is inseparable from the self when somebody is not an ideologist but someone who follows his interests. In a life rejecting subjectivity the nothing can only be the new ideal. It is from this that the morality of death springs. When nihil becomes a construct it turns into a permanent place of dwelling of a throne of hate for anything that isn't a part of ones subjectivity, a non desire to experience anything that one doesn't understand, a moralistic



imperative of hate and destruction of life itself and not the destruction of existence as a universal sacred which actually affirms life. To destroy the purpose of existence is exactly because you want to experience the chaos unchained going beyond the monolithism of human observation and atrophic wills to live (to live not to exist), enclosing someone into life denying anti-realistic solipsism.

On the throne of the eco-extremist ideology stand people who use the word terrorist with pride, terms-roles that have been given by the societies of humanlings and lobotomized citizens, the same societies and citizens who these people want to oppose and this pride comes from the term's direct consolidation by the society of bufoons, it is the acceptance of an "antisocial" role keeping up the dialectic and not being antisocial as going beyond thus seeing society in essence as a non-existent ghost, which of course consolidates itself physically through mass approaches/ideologemes and spreads gradually the total control through the institutionalization of role systems. Eco-extremists adopt the image that authoritarian discourses have created. An image of the civilised world. It is still a link to society, to its moralistic dualism, the same thing that anarchists do with the role of the political prisoner to show they are imprisoned for their ideas and they are not "criminals", a term drenched in moral discourse and deeply connected to the fantasy of Justice, which could also justify the existence of prisons. The way the eco-extremists and their likes name themselves as "terrorist" announces to society an identity, it doesn't go against the society of the spectacle, it just reproduces it with a negative sign. They create "their own" profile which exists only in conjunction with images. As with the spectacularized reality these create "who you are", whereas in essence they create inside society who you are, which is inseparable from it. They also show a tendency to present the actions through the media, which confirm and corroborate the reified Ego, being connected to the spectacle and the narcissistic culture of modern civilisation. The ideologicalization of various psychological states labeled "bad" by society through a morality of anti-ethics is either delusional or pretentious. My rejection of the word terrorist is not because I see it from a point of view of a morally infused term which binds one to a supposedly unwanted image of generalized criminality, I couldn't care less about that, although I do not fetishize illegalism (or anything), but because it is a term essentially created by the shepherds for the masses. The anarchist terrorism and illegalism are as I see them integral practises (exactly as I say it, as tools, practises not crystalization of roles) for the self-realization, the communication of anarchist ways of thinking or even survival in a reality like this, but not the practises in themselves, nothing is essential for me that would function as a form of oppositional definition versus the masses but instead it would become hetero-definition from them. What distinguishes you from the mass is if you have built your personal conscience and for what reason you use the practises you use. The insurrected individuality "is" something only for the moment he uses it. If terrorism (a practise that aims at causing fear to a certain enemy) and illegalism are not used instrumentally but instead under the meaning that the authoritarian images and capitalistic spectacle give them then they are products of the mass. Someone might ask me, the anarchist, the nihilist or the egoist, can they become roles? My answer is yes. If one uses the words as an indication of culture and doesn't give them his/her own meaning and content without any commitment to fulfill them as "they are supposed to be" then they are products, roles of society. The structures of society for me are not only identified in the criticism of the dominant models. By not deconstructing first and foremost society and the alienation that has offered so many years, the war against civilisation seems so rigid and monolithic. These people also believe in a social ideal

which is manifested through ancient traditions. The social ideal of the hunter gatherer lifestyle is a violent flagellation of the person. Another lullaby of autonomous communities which contain "autonomous" individuals. Another manifestation of the ghost of Society but with an ancient prefix so in the eyes of these people it has nothing to do with society, because again society is perceived as the contemporary physical model without even touching the half of its aspects, the same way they view civilisation.

This approach to an opposition to civilisation alienates and creates barriers towards an amoral perception of life where only choices are left and not duties. Where one sees the content of the self as a monosignificant being and not as a tool in the service of metaphysical inherent values, "essences". This ideology replaces one culture with another. One model with another. The modern ones with the historically primitive. But my own anti-civilisation attack begins from the individuality, every culture and their established ethos is a chain of the individuality, every model is an ideal to live up to and reduce the possibilities of a chaotic individuality, the ego and the pursuit of its desires which is the only thing that stands against civilisation. All the narrations about "the wild", everything which is monolithically expressed as whatever is outside of the domesticated human animal, what the human animal either must conform to by "reconnecting" to something or has it inside him/her if he belongs to an "enlightened" elite few to whom it was disclosed as a "revelation" through prescribed attitudes and means (or even worse they have it "in their blood"), is the other side of the same coin. A civilised narration and a product of alienation. "The Wild" as a chain of theology replaces every other religion with paganism and the worship of ghosts which are placed over the ego. The determinism of saying that humans are believers by nature ideologicalizes religion as a universal truth and consolidates one of the biggest chains of authority over one's will. It is another thing to respect a forest or a mountaintop because they have offered you moments that are connected to yourself and another to see those as sacred. "The Wild" also implies another inherent characteristic of "human nature" and reveals the humanist perception of such claims and therefore the elimination of diversity and uniqueness without predetermined duties.

Now about the absolute truth in Nature. When and if they start criticizing society sometime they might see how many absolute truths are out there. How many ideologists, moralists, religious hold absolute truths and cast their judgements from them. Convictions to external things which creates duties is also a weapon of society and offers the person as sacrifice. Duties are created from absolute truths, it is the creation of soldiers not of insurrected individual egos, of uniqueness against every idol. And I'm not a carrier of anti-dogmatic dogmatism with the meaning of an egalitarian worthiness between various theories which oppose whichever reified ghost that any mass logic keeps in the minds. I'm not a tolerant person, this doesn't mean that I'm intolerant either. To create your personal truths is something healthy for me, but when you're on the move you'll have to destroy them and never care what happens out of it. As a personal tool it is not seen as a universal sacred and therefore it can be destroyed easily at any time when you realize it doesn't help you anymore or isn't relevant to your reality. This also leaves space for communication with other egos that doesn't leave space for depersonalisation because of reified concepts.

The mountains, the rivers or the volcanoes do not care about the human stupidity and wretchedness, they don't have human consciousness, they are not entities, they are just sometimes

terrifying or beautiful parts of chaos that when the enthusiasts of domination "control" or seek to understand from a point of view of a different world they create a mental death of alienation which spreads as mass plague to the physical reality. So the components of the earthly environment don't seek revenge! They haven't formed an alliance and nobody has "asked" them or knows what they "do". Of course they react and change with every other interaction that takes place between living beings but this is a completely different thing. This is the flow of chaos. But these ideologies give them the form of gods who destroy and therefore the role of the ally-comrade. Another sign of the anthropocentric anthropomorphism of human perception which is a product of civilisation. There is so much anthropomorphism in the perception of people who try to oppose anthropocentrism.

The anti-humanist humanism doesn't mean that it is really anti-humanism. My anti-humanism is not the opposite of whichever humanism but the disregard of any of these attempts as metaphysical chains. Anti-humanism can be legitimate humanism if it doesn't oppose the ghost of whichever "human nature" constructed by whichever ideology to obfuscate the will of acting from oneself for anything that is a part of one's own self. This point of view of seeing whichever "essential" characteristics that constitute "the human" as simply an abstract ideologeme which creates an objective profile-role does not leave space for any ideology to use this social construct presented as however it suits them to recruit soldiers in its cause and direct them towards either saving the carriers of this "essence" if it is seen as "good" or destroying them if it is seen as "evil". Anti-humanism as the negation of any predetermined human condition goes beyond chains, it is not only the disregard of human life as a sacred pedestal of natural or civil rights. It is a tool against moralism and superstition to help each individuality form their own perceptions based on who they are in conjunction with their desires according to the circumstances they live in and decide how to act according to the specific situations that arise. So the contemporary model of the idol of Human and the ideologeme of Progress disappointed the eco-extremists but they found its replacement in an alternative model of the primitive hunter-gatherer, which is the disclosed "true human nature" of the past which supposedly changed with the advancement of scientific knowledge and the so called "progress", the "wild human nature" (which these people say they cling to). The grotesque supposed essentiality which enslaves perpetually age after age the hordes of its mass zealots has made it even in the hearts of these angry and as it seems experienced, in terms of war, individuals. Another model of the remaining fragments of "human essentiality", the Wild. The rag of the ghost of the Human is trying to revive its relic as the "ultimate enemy" of the contemporary mediocre citizen carrier of the ghost of Equality but with maintaining the same ideological structures since it is a quest for an "essence" not a desire to experience unchained chaos. The individuality becomes a servant of some products of reification. Humanity is just a clog in the sewer of existence. The construct not the actual beings, but the actual beings who have perceived their whole existence through the lens of this abstraction are now rightful owners of the sewer itself. Those who have ideologicalized the "bad" side of human beings as an essence, the side that is fully consumed by that which the carrier of this view hates, cast judgements from their own internalized "good" even if they do not admit they do so. Seeing as such themselves still as parts of the fake entity of Humanity or as an elite force who tries to illuminate the "worthy", regardless of what attitude they will follow after this myopic realization. So they actually embrace a devastating determinism over their individuality. This kind of anti-humanism is half and it creates an ideological misanthropy, a chain, not a free of idealism

misanthropy, a part of the person itself that doesn't strive for "worthiness" or accepts "unworthiness", a part of its experiences which create a perception and an attitude but is never actually complete, and not as a moral superstition and prejudice.

Cultures and persons who fought against the western civilisation do not represent anyone from our era, nor do the persons who mention them represent them and thus they automatically become irrelevant. It is just somewhere to cling to when you perceive civilisation like so. What kind of tools could one salvage in the now? The metaphysical references or the outdated equipment? Probably just the heroism, another product of societal regurgitation of the person. If they are considered ancestors or heritage I don't see at any level this perception to differ from the ghost of the Nation. The abstraction of the nation is the continuation of the faith of belonging to a mass, the perpetuation of "heritage", namely, the cause that has been left on the shoulders of its faithful. "Heritage" is the chain of the faithful in the older "better" epochs of human masses that has to be perpetuated. Culture and various lifestyles is the indication of a mass, of morals and customs, namely, of traditions and systematized ethics, of prescribed attitudes and behaviors, namely, of an ethos, the setting of pillars for civilisation to exist. But I am a negator of every human union based on ghosts. Whether it's named ancestry, heritage, culture, customs, tradition it's the same for me. All are authority and duties over the person. The eco-extremist ideology maintains revolutionary subjects, identities as the previous so many identity politics revolutionary constructs. Ideologemes of "complete destruction" are rooted deeply in revolutionary morality and always aim automatically, no matter the mantle they cover themselves with, at recruiting soldiers for the Vision. Making the Idea something significant because they hold it sacred in their hearts. It is the "holy spirit".

The ego for me is the only giver and taker of values, but the ego is not a role that must be fulfilled like all the others. It is not a new god. The ego, the self is a new world for each one who will come facing with ANYTHING outside of him/her. For what reason? For the only reason which even if monolithic will not create a monolithic outcome, to live for being yourself, a free of herd mentality individual and enjoy it no matter what the outcome of this will be. But don't wait for others to embrace this philosophy because they won't, visualise what you want to do and if you're strong enough do it and don't care. Otherwise you would be expecting from the mass to become persons in this total authoritarian alienating reality. Anyway even if the whole world started embracing now an egoist philosophy and approach to ways of thinking and acting we could still be enemies because the egoists doesn't necessarily mean they are "comrades". Better though in my opinion to fight against conscious egoists than the mass. The mass is very strong, it is an interconnected slime of nothingness that an egoist doesn't stand a chance against, although he/she is completely superior as a being, because at least he/she is a being and not an adherence to an abstraction. I don't know what this world is and I don't care to "learn". I only care to experience it. Fuck everyone and everything. I desire to destroy existence as a universal sacred. Existence is a means to live, it is not a deterministic purpose. I prefer to exist to live, I do not want to live to exist.

Against modernity and the ghost of Progress destroying the past simultaneously!

Against the entirety of civilisation carrying the sharp knife of the anarchist nihilism!

Against Nature and metaphysical quests for carrions!

Against dualism, with your mind and body create anarchy and re-appraise your life in the now!



***Breaking the windows that sell the products of civilisation (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 3)***

Everyone tries to present their products of reification as the best from all the others. On the one hand the anarchists as rhetoricians of Freedom with their recipes for "equality", of "unity", multiformism and "destruction of the existent" as materialisation and realization of an ideologeme called Freedom as well as final purpose of erection of the anarchist civilisation, idealistic ideologemes that expect the person to become a zealot and on the other hand the eco-radicals and their movements against technology and modernism try to create the picture of the ghost of Nature in "wildness" and in the primitivist ideals with the war of the "natural" civilisation against the "artificial" one. Or pardon me for my "mistake", they fight for the "total destruction" of civilisation since civilisation is seen as the monolith it is presented like manichean battles between "natural" - "artificial", "wild" - "civilised", "primitive" - "modern", "instinctive" - "rational" and finally the real dimension of this separation of chaos which is nothing else than the moralistic battle between monoliths such as "good" - "evil", "right" - "wrong". Though for the one who sees civilisation for what it is, namely chains of morality against the realisation of desire, culture, namely homogenization of behaviors and values through systematization (morals and customs) and ideological bonds, anthropocentric perception of everything outside of the individual, fake unions of the weak named societies which invented the ideologeme of the State or any other way they might name it, mass destructions of whichever form of life, either conscious or not, to feed the ghosts that have literally taken the form of flesh and bones through the union of pseudo-consciousness of the

"universally significant" and righteous trash of the human species, the systematization and monstrosities yet another time in the name of the universality of the religion of Progress, the myth of survival which became necessity more and more through the raise of population of the humans creating the hyper fortresses prisons and ultimate separation of the humans from anything else which is non systematically alive, named cities, and lastly the annihilation of the unique individuality through the repeated procedures and the ultimate masking of chaos of diversity, of the unknown and the will. For this psycho, this intruder, the poisoner of every civilisation there are no easy solutions, if any at all. For him/her there is only what he creates himself, everything else is a product which can become civilised virtual reality. For him/her there is a journey through shit and self-realization without separating life or death as means of self-realization. For this person there is a whole continent that the slaves of ghosts try to take it from his/her hands, his/her own self.

What I have understood is that our lives don't belong to us inside the ghosts of civilisation. Though there are still the imperious wanderers of nowhere who seek for the creation which is interconnected to destruction which springs from the personal pursuit of the self and not from the products of civilisation. Civilisation devours everything in its path, the will is channeled where the products that are served to us guide, the individuality is confined in cultural authority of systematized ethics, in the morality of absolute truths, in the logic of the exact opposite, in the construction of ideals which are scarecrows for the possibilities in existence, in the death of chance for the flow of life, in the erection of castles for the siege on the "enemy". Society devours every autonomy and civilisation and the various cultural confines devour every new creation, every detachment from commodified contents. The procedures of civilisation open stores that sell Life, I'm refering to an image not lived experiences. The defiance of civilisation comes in the present with the egoistic personal destruction-creation, with the vigilance of the ego and the rise of the life of the individuality through the application of his/her content, destroying every production of morality and the reification of ideas.





#### ***My misanthropism (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 4)***

*I look wholeheartedly into myself and I see my "teratogenesis". I locate its roots and its flow. I do not try to exorcise it though, I embrace it. Thereafter, I look at all of the "normal" ones and I feel a boundless odium to pierce me, like flaying my skin and throwing it down like a shred. And there I realize that I am a misanthropist.*

Misanthropism is a sentiment that emerges from the perception that "we" will never come to an agreement between "us" in contrast to various ideological prophecies because on the inside we are chaotic beings in a chaotic existence. If there weren't the domesticating ideologies the raw desires would show the unmasked uniqueness and real diversity between all of the human animals. Through this there would be many more developments and changes than those we observe in the civilised world. What exactly would these be and how would they look like, I don't know of course, but they would be much more authentic. Misanthropism intensifies (although this is not its root) in moments where you realize that for the humans, the more their life becomes systematized in today's civilization, the more ideology and morality become more real than themselves and their desires and as a result their desires are channeled totally in the faith of reified terms and thus their will becomes the will of things, ideologemes, ghosts in the attempt to cover the weakness of the sense of



belonging. The non-ideologicalized, authentic, dynamic, brutish, imperious solitude is seen as leprosy. There comes the blossoming of so many beliefs in terms that teach "what is what" in life. The flow of life as not having any standard, namely the discovery of the world starting from the void of nothing and wandering as an aimless being, is being thrown out as trash and replaced by products of cognition which "unite" the humans or separate them dualistically, dependent on the point of view. It is there where every morality, every ideology, every religion, or every idealization of some supposed co-existence begins to believe more and more, through their progression of numbers of zealots, that it will somehow convince "the rest" to take their side, or when it destroys "the eternal enemies" then everyone will see the "right" ways and paths. There is the moment for me where the feelings of misanthropism are high, from the stupidity, the blindness, the fanaticism, the shrines that are created by the most of the humans because of the fear of the existential void and of course of death. My misanthropism is the hate for the stupidity of belonging and of the necessary systematization that springs out from the ideas of maintenance of existence. The hate against every of these fears but also the search of essentiality of human existence into a supposed objective, universal value of existence itself. Misanthropism for me is the insurrection against objectified existence and the internalized attempt for perpetuation of the "species" as it "should be" or "could be". It creates indifference for the humans I don't know but not for those I chose to value. Against the conscience of ideologemes that become a cage of urgency of prescriptions of a supposedly universal value of existence. It is not against life, pleasure and satisfaction. Of course I perceive life much differently than any idealist. It is against existence for the purpose of existence. How I will act in this context depends on my destructive creativity and from the lucidity of my choices. My misanthropism is not a dogma about how one "should" face existence so as not to fall into contradictions according to ones self-imprisoning ideologemes but a summation of aspects of my personal experiences in life but also of my interpretation of reality that lead to realizations and vomit the internality with behaviors, feelings and a completely different aesthetic confrontation of the world. I don't care about the human kind and its conclusion, just for the destruction of idolization of history, not from some supposedly "bad essence" but because before I came to this world I wasn't asked if I wanted to dive into a world of human history only to find my place into it. I deny to participate in the carnival of human history and of the decision of which era was the "best" so as to take lessons for my own life. My misanthropism is deep, it is not a disillusionment for the contemporary human model, it is the indifference towards the history of human kind and its models. A contempt for the unavoidable notion of civilisation. A continuous tendency that doesn't deny the search for authentic relations (I don't speak about "perfection"). Human behaviors and perceptions will always evolve according to the cultural events of every era, although instincts is something that particularly interests me. Are there primordial instincts or are they determinate by the civilised existence? We will never know. Personally I consider there are but they are altered by the so many rules that we are being taught from a young age and that certainly create different tendencies inside each person since they constitute pieces of the immanent tendencies which are integral to each individuality. I also consider that instincts which arise in today's totally systematized alienation are more of a mechanism of self-repression than a force of liberation, like a continuation of this very same subconscious alienation.

Inside the chaotic existence there are no rules. Humans create rules. Why do humans create rules

though? For the purpose of co-existence, of meaning, of objectivity. Purposes which in my eyes are carcinoma and not affirmation of life. On this basis every kind of systems are created. There is where civilisation bases itself and spreads domination more and more. Civilisation and domination are created by humans. Starting with the basic rules of concertation like language, which becomes a reified content that offers systematized empty communication with the evolution of rules/norms named as common values. As these had been evolving, new more powerful systems were created, like the State, namely, the gregarious ideologeme of management and "security" and the surrender of personal power, Society, namely the fear of monosignificant existence which the faith of belonging creates and spreads as agreements of unquestionable systems, which take form in the physical world so as "harmony" can exist, mostly for the human species which is the biggest object of worship in the windows of the contemporary era of western civilisation and all systems are supposedly created in its service, which aren't of course but so many believe they are. Or are they, at least in the minds of some? And who knows how many of the human cogs in the machine, out of their "obligation" in the service of their species, try to actually contribute to its perpetuation and by doing this in their stupidity they become key figures in the strengthening of the systems. Of course in the present reality many acquire their roles because of a position of power inside the system and the material profits it offers. Do I "excuse" any of them? Absolutely not. Do I condemn them from a sense of internalized "right"? No. I am completely indifferent in front of the schemes of idiocy. But my values are my own, because they make me enjoy life more, so I will stand against anyone who becomes an obstacle to this. I only feel affinity with those who will power in order to destroy chains over their self experienced selves and live their lives to the fullest of their strength, before letting it succumb to relations of domination, for various known and unknown reasons, or at least die not as heroes, food for the mass, but as themselves, preferably when they choose.

Of course misanthropism can become an ideological fossil, moralistic and religious which flagellates and consumes the flow of life. Here comes the eternal war between most anarchists being humanists, other philanthropists and faithful to the ghost of Humanity, and the various elitists that see all humans as "unworthy" to live on the earth and generally themselves as some kind of chosen ones because of some "revelation", other romantics and dissapointed still believing in the ghost of Humanity seeing it as "evil". My misanthropism has nothing to do with these remnants and thus goes beyond "good" and "evil" with anti-humanism as a tool of analysis that sees every individuality as unique and inseparable from itself wholeness, as well as with no predetermined value enclosing existence in the prison of the supposedly natural rights, that suppress the chaotic flow of life.

*With the sentiment and the consciousness I call out... I hate you all! We have war. No one reassure. To kill the ghosts you must not be afraid of the dark. You must not be afraid of solitude. I will uproot the maggoty existence. I will become nothing. And for this, everyone will hate me.*

***Archegonos***



### *Wildness in the City*

Many people have asked me why I choose to live in San Francisco. If I love the wilderness and feel a connection to the natural world, how come I live in the midst of human society? As an anti-industrialist my activism and writings focus on wildness, animals, anti-technology, freedom and a small touch of misanthropy. Isn't it contradictory to live in a big city? Yes, there is a level of contradiction as well as hypocrisy in my life. As everyone is connected to this civilization, all those opposing techno-society are engaged in a contradiction in one way or another. But is this distinction between the city and the wild absolute? Are cities devoid of wildness?

As I walk down the street here in this toxic cement jungle with cars and people tearing around me, rushing to work, shop, consume and die, I feel alienated from the natural world. The trees are planted individually in small squares of dirt surrounded by concrete. These trees are always in perfect rows like everything else in this city. Everything in the city is in grids and lines, nothing is non-linear or spontaneous. Every decision that is made in the creation of this city is made to fit as many people as possible into the smallest space, offering them the most amount of products to consume. Cities are concrete scabs on what was once beautiful wilderness. Most of the world is now covered in almost identical scabs. If you are caught up in the rat race this is all you might see, but is this all that is out there?

When I walk down the street I see something different. I see the scab, the toxicity and the drone; consuming, breeding and not dying quick enough. But I also see something else. I see millions of cracks in the sidewalks from the movement of the earth's surface. The static nature of concrete is not compatible with the spontaneous movement of the earth. The roads, sidewalks, and buildings which seem so strong will not last against the evolving motion of the planet we call home.

Another beautiful thing I see as I walk down the street are thousands of weeds and mushrooms. Weeds creep up through the cracks in the concrete and keep the trees company that humans feel should be isolated. Mushrooms pop up through the cracks in the wall of apartments, forcing people to interact with nature even in their solitary little boxes. Both weeds and fungi are great examples of how humans lack of control over the natural world. No matter how many chemicals and toxins humans use they can never rid themselves of these "pests" which are abundant in the cities.

There is also the more apparent urban wildlife that is in every city. There are the falcons that live and swoop cars in New York City. Mountain lions are now appearing in southern California suburbs. Here in San Francisco we have many different species you can run into, from the mice and rats in the train tunnels to opossums and even deer. There is one species though that I personally love to hang out with, that is the raccoon. These little mischievous creatures wreak havoc on the city every evening digging through trash, knocking over trash cans, breaking into apartments and raiding kitchens and devouring pet food. I even know someone who was riding their bike through Golden Gate Park one evening and was knocked off her bike by a pack of raccoons. There is a sense of friendship I feel with the raccoons I used to hang out with. For one year I used to sit on my apartment roof with the same raccoon as I drank beer. One night she brought over three young raccoons. For hours the four of us would watch each other, play and taunt one another. Every night until I moved from that house I spent a few hours with my non-human friends.

There is another aspect of living in San Francisco: the biggest wilderness in the world is only a few miles from my door step. It takes me minutes to get to the Pacific Ocean. There is a connection with the ocean that is hard to explain but if you can't smell or taste the ocean in the air you feel a craving for this lucid and chaotic body of water. I can spend hours walking on the beach, or standing on rocks with the waves crashing around me. There is nothing in the world more exciting and powerful as running on the beach in the middle of a thunderstorm. The wind almost picking you up, lightning striking the ocean and the waves crashing on the beach.

The more humans encroach on the wild the more species will adapt to survive in an urban environment. Though this is not a new idea by any means it will start to teach people that we are not in control. But until this society crumbles the more wildlife I see in the cities the happier I'll be, for it helps me connect with my own wild side and makes me feel as if the collapse is happening quicker. You never know maybe even in a few years there will be mountain lions and bears roaming the streets of San Francisco.

### *The Question of Ideology*

What role does ideology play on our path of resistance? This is an important question for the longevity and fluidity of our community (community being larger than EF!, all encompassing the

resistance to industrialism.) The ideologues on every side will explain that we need a coherent dialectic to follow and that ideology plays an important role in creating a “revolutionary” platform for us to move forward. But is this true? Can insurrection come from external ideas or does it need to come from within us as individuals and our personal connection to the wild.

Can ideology fit into a wild insurrection? To answer this question we must define ideology. Ideology is false consciousness. It doesn't come from within us it comes from someone else; an idea created from their experience then given to us as a mold. There are many forms of ideology, fitting into every aspect of our lives: capitalism, communism, atheism, theism, humanism, rationalism, in the orthodox branch anarchism and in academic biocentrism. All of these were created outside of us as individuals centering the world outside of our personal experiences.

Because ideology doesn't come from within us we can not fully experience or define it in our own words. Often you hear statements like “Marxism says...” or “Biocentrism says...” and “The Bible states...”, instead of “I feel...” or “I think...” These external ideas can not be fluid because they are already established in one form or another as “legitimate thought.” They are used to justify our actions and ideas. Because we don't trust our own ideas, experiences and desires we must make them valid by fitting them into an external box of thought. It is because we must fit into this box instead of letting our ideas stand on their own that ideology becomes rigid and dogmatic. We do not have the ability to change and evolve with ideology because it is not ours, we are a part of it instead of it being a part of us.

This is not to say that the ideologies out there don't have some good ideas mixed up with their dogma. Almost all ideologies can teach us something, they have ideas that can expand our individual understanding of the world. But the important thing is to take these ideas when they fit in with our personal understanding of life and expand them to fit our personal world view. The same goes with citing individual authors. There is a level of comradere and strength in agreement, as long as this agreement is personal. To say “I agree with John Zerzan when he says...” or “I feel that Kirkpatrick Sale made a good point when he wrote...” This is personal, to take a personal idea from a conversation or article we read and apply it to our personal understanding. This strengthens and supports our ideas while keeping them ours. But ideologies such as “biocentrism” or “Marxism” are not individuals they are abstract ideas. To sight these as “legitimate sources” instead of individuals as personal sources you keep the dialogue in academic realms instead of personal everyday life.

### *Ideology's Effect on Action*

If our ideas become rigid and dogmatic in the midst of ideology, what happens to our actions? I answer that our actions become stagnant and ineffective. Factionalizing happens quickly as vicious and ugly fights break out over “moral, correct and right tactics.” Just as with our ideas when we cling to ideology to justify our actions they become rigid and do not flow and evolve as is necessary to be effective.

As long as EF! has existed there has been an ideological split that has been battling under the guise of “strategy.” It again has resurfaced in the last few issues of this paper in the wake of the Vail arson. Will this disagreement ever be resolved? No, not unless each ideological faction splits into its own

ideological movement. Or we, as a resistance community, abandon ideological thinking and ideologically-driven actions. The debate of sabotage vs. civil disobedience is not a strategic debate; it is a ideological/moralistic debate. Thus not leaving room for diversity within the community of resistance.

I am not asking “why can’t we all just get along?” I understand that there are differences of opinion and I, myself, have very strong feeling on this topic. My opinion is based on my personal experiences, desires and view of efficiency instead of ideology or an external moralism. Because this is my understanding and what is right for me I do not judge others (or try not to) for what is best for them based on their experiences and desires. By bringing the debate out of the ideological realm into the practical and personal realm we can have authentic discussions on effectiveness and personal experiences leaving room for our differences.

### *Wild Self-theory*

If ideology is destructive for our community of resistance where should we place our ideas? We need to form self-theory based in our own wildness and our personal connection to the wild we have experienced. I do not have the same connections to the wild as my friends who are “desert rats.” They prefer hot and dry climates, backpacking in the desert, sage brush and cactus. Just the same they can not know my connection to the ocean, sharks, sea gulls and raccoons. We respect and understand each others desire for a free and wild nature and experience. But we can not fully understand each others’ emotional and personal base connection to the wild.

By creating an ideology around such a personal connection and emotion we sterilize and smother these wild desires, emotions and experiences. Our ideas cannot be presented in any way but thousands of individual ideas networked for a common goal; a wild and free world. Anything short of this is a disgrace to our wild visions and the diverse wildernesses we love and defend.

If we create a resistance community based on a network of self-theorists instead of ideologues and slogans, our actions will be more compatible and more productive. If the ideological lines have been brought down we can except each other’s actions as driven by our self-theory and desires thus is correct for our individual part of the larger community of resistance. This respect and understanding will help to create a more encompassing and tolerant community towards the diverse tactical choices individuals make. Another strength that will come from actions driven by the desires of individuals and collectives is raw passion. Not to say that this passion is not already there but many individuals feel they need to fit into one “box of thought” or the other. By expanding the freedom to tactics that we desire in the natural world, individuals will act from the heart. When an action comes from the heart one puts all their effort (and hopefully their intelligence) into the form of resistance they chose.

I live in San Fransisco, California, I have chosen not to participate in the Headwaters campaign because of our differences of opinion regarding tactics and participation with authorities. If the individuals engaging in this campaign have chosen this path I can not tell them they are “wrong.” I will engage in dialogue with them, share my ideas and perspective and hear theirs. Since we do not have the same desires regarding tactics I chose not to work on their campaign, with respect, because

the goal to protect the redwoods I understand. Instead of fighting with them about our differences I found a few individuals with similar desires towards tactics and I work with them. We fight a similar battle on a different front.

Let us tear down the walls of ideology, free our minds and desires towards authentic resistance. For if we are fighting for a wild and free world, free beings interacting and experiencing each other we can not build this world with rules and rigid thought. So, while each of us is fighting to free animals and the land itself, let's remember to also free our desires and our own wildness. Think for yourself and act, but most importantly think while you act!

**Chris Kortright**



### ***A Life***

*To the friends of Nichilismo*

#### **Memories**

*“My youth was just a dark hurricane  
passed through here and there by brilliant suns;  
the lightning and the rain wreaked so much havoc,  
that few vermilion fruits were left in my garden.”*

— Charles Baudelaire

In a distant spring, gleaming with green and sun, my youthful spirit wandered gently through the



divine forests of the sky. One day, a sad day in autumn, it came back to me, disconsolate, weeping. A groups of Angels with large, black wings accompanied it silently. It told me: "God is dead! The great Pan is dead!" The Sun went dark, rivers filled with mud, and plants trembled. Darkness wrapped the Earth in her funeral shroud. Then at my back I heard the satanic thunder of a hellish laugh. It was the laughter of the for whom I had waited, perhaps unaware, for so long: the Demon. He told me: "Come with me!" He brought me into the corrupt city where the *true* sun has never laid its kiss.

Dance of specters. Darkness. Silence... Beside a temple built for the Goddess of Perversity and Knowledge, a Fountain of Blood gurgled, as if reciting a cursed prayer.

The Demon was somber and black like the tragic Night. From his yellow, phosphorous eyes a ray of sinister light flowed. Suddenly he told me "Goodbye!" and quickly vanished.

I cried out. I was alone in the deepest darkness. The Fountain continued to recite its cursed prayer. Did I tremble? Maybe. I don't know... I don't recall... Suddenly the gates of the temple of the Goddess of Perversity and Knowledge flew open and the Fountain of Blood transmuted into the beautiful body of a voluptuous young woman.

"I love you" — she told me — "and I want you. You have to be mine!" I looked into the depth of her eyes. I recognized her. She was the Image perceived through a morbid dream of Matter. A hellish mob blossomed from my mind, inspiring in me a Dionysian quiver.

"Matter is everything!" I forgot the place and time and tried to catch that naked and beautiful body so I could take it in my arms and grasp it tightly to my breast.

"No, not here!..." she told me. And taking my hot and feverish hand in her small, cool one, she led me through the flowery entrance of a cavern in which a group of young witches danced. We abandoned ourselves to a wild embrace, and my large, gaping, passionate mouth enclosed her tiny, beautiful lips in a bite. We closed our eyes. In the midst of so much darkness, I noticed that my mind was not dead, since it had never seen a vaster sea of light.

I don't know how much time passed. I was suddenly roused by the roar of a funeral march echoing dismally from the bottom of the cavern. Laughing wildly, my companion told me: "The witches are dead. Our embrace killed them. I am avenged!" And saying this, she turned pale, stiffened and became a rock.

A young serpent with eyes of fire and a bloodstained mouth rose up before me: "You have brought death to my lovers and killed Love." "And what does that matter?" I answered.

"I have known him a long time," I continued, "this hypocritical, cynical and cruel God of yours. I have seen him insult and mangle so many of my sisters. I have seen him — like all other Gods — shedding blood, devastating brains, feeding on young hearts, always for his own lustful body, in a hot bath of tears." The serpent bowed his head and said to me, "Look?!" and stuck his neck out at me. There he held the mirror of Life, upside-down. I looked into it and saw myself. In the mirror, I was nothing but a large skull. Thick black clouds lowered over my head. They were funeral hearses for my smothered dreams.

I saw my woman of stone nearly move.

Goblins loaded her onto a cloud that the wind drove into the heights and scattered in the distance.

Then the serpent's mouth vomited blood and made the ground open under my feet. I fell into a bottomless abyss. Suspended in the void, I again saw the Demon.

"Brother, listen to me..." I said to him. And I whispered a few words in his ear.

Even he was pale, moved, and he answered me: "It is impossible to believe it. Ah, if I could do it!..."

Again my mind quivered. But then he suddenly burst out laughing. "What does it matter to you? Haven't you seen the mirror of Life?" He brought me by an unknown path and led me back to the magnificent Earth to mock Man, the Overman, the Demon and God.

## Torment

*"I know, how much pain and sweat  
and baking sun it takes on the flaming hill  
To engender my life and to give me soul"*

— Charles Baudelaire

Man, Demon and God have come together to defile my virgin garden. (I don't know why the Overman has not gotten there.) They are right in front of me like three perverse allegories. God tells me: "I am the unattainable good to which you should aspire. Sacrifice yourself, deny yourself, and you will reach me."

The Demon tells me: "I will give you happiness if you will worship me."

Man tells me: "I am the *Ideal* of atheists. Be me."

I laugh. I laugh, but my laughter is not calm.

I feel that I am not Man, that I do not worship the Demon, that I do not sacrifice myself on the altar of any God; and yet, I still don't have the mathematical certainty of being my own I, the lord of my fantastic realm. This is my torment. When God tells me: "Killing is bad!"; when the Demon tells me: "Killing is necessary"; when Man tells me: "Great is the one who dies for the Ideal"; I answer each one of them: "That's not true!"

Someone knew that I loved conflict and said to me: "I have thousands of men with me, brave and valiant warriors, we will win. Come with us." I asked him: "Why are you fighting?" "For the greatness of the Fatherland," he answered.

"I have no fatherland."

I met other men: "We know that you are a valiant warrior. Come with us. We will pour out our last drop of blood for the redemption of humanity."

I answered: "I don't believe in humanity, I don't believe in its redemption."

The group's leader scowled and looked at me with contempt: "You are a coward!"

I laugh. But my laughter still is not calm. I feel something bitter inside me that torments me.

I feel something inside me that is so deeply intimate that I don't know how to explain, that no one could ever explain. I feel within myself the UNSAYABLE!

It is *my unique self*, which no one knows. Is this perhaps my torment? Perhaps. Because perhaps it is my *Happiness*. Because perhaps it is the spring that quenches my thirst, that leads me to the final edge of the I which wants to expand itself and throb in the strong, vast spasm of the Everything, so as to dissolve triumphantly in the Nothing.

## Flight

*"Must one depart? Or stay?... If you can, stay;  
Depart, if you must."*

— Charles Baudelaire

My arrow is ready, my will is rejuvenated, my potency proved. How could I wait any longer?

Yes, I must depart. It is time, it is time!

*Nihil, nihil!*

Tormented, my mind flies. It flies to with the wings of Reality over the world of dreams, towards

broader horizons, towards my eternity.

I can no longer dream, I am the dream of myself. The friend of my possible traveling companions.

Oh friends, oh friends, where are you?

Don't you see, over there, the Face of Eternity and Mystery? It is necessary to unravel the final riddle of the eternal. Come on, friends, come, it is time, it is time!

...

Have you arrived?

I have never seen a sky as peaceful as your faces, oh friends.

How beautiful it is to understand each other.

We are on a frail boat, lost at sea. No more dawns, or dusks, or destinations. We have only sun, light, heat, depth and distance.

Do you hear? Eternity raises her most beautiful song to Life, as she demands of us the bridal rose garland. Oh friends, the roses, where are the roses?

What a poor, what a miserable thing the land where we lived was!

Do you still remember it, oh friends?

There golden dawns rose, but black nights fell...

There men dreamed of collective aims and measured time...

Ah, friends, friends, I am assailed by an immense pity for that poor land...

So what is happening to me?...

Let's forget it! For how many thousands of years have we floated on the endless waves of this vast depth that raises us to the regions of the Sun, above the Sun?

And for how many thousands of years will we yet live?

Ah, jolly Eternity, eternal happy now!

May no one ever know the secret happiness that fills our solitary hearts, oh friends!

Have we not stoically suffered in forced silence?

No, no, may no one ever know our cruelest sorrows, nor the infinite happiness of this eternal noon.

In the grotesque old world, they now believe that we are dead.

And instead, we have married eternity, we — the loners!

— But the roses, oh friends? Where are the roses? Oh, red roses of Eternal Revolt

*Renzo Novatore*



***Udine, Italy – Insurrection or revolution?***

Udine, 2nd May 2016

A few points for thought

We are used to considering the words 'insurrection' and 'revolution' to mean the same thing. But do they really?

A revolution is a radical change of the existing order. Like reformism it seeks to change the existing order, with the difference that with reformism the change is gradual rather than radical. Theoretically the three methods, reform, revolution and insurrection, could or rather should assume the same basic impulse of the negation of the existent, given that – as reason would have it – if one desires something other and affirms it, one is denying the present.

Besides not existing, the future is the negation of the present on a theoretical level. In the present historical context – the aborted debate on insurrection and revolution in the configuration of revolutionary perspectives of the past is another question – the revolutionary horizon is an abstraction of the other [translator's italics] present, that is to say the future, the ultimate non-place, it being an absolutely other time, also in relation to the plan of ongoing existence, to use an Aristotelian category. However, apart from a few distinctions to be considered elsewhere, reform, revolution and insurrection say nothing to us about the other they would like, only that they aspire to the other and the method they mean to use to achieve it. What we have said so far, and will say, concerns one of the two elements to be gone into here, namely why insurrection is to be preferred

to revolution.

But there is another aspect, that of context, which leads to the same conclusions, whether we like it or not. Here we are talking of the historical impossibility of a revolution.

Why struggle then? This is the question posed by the militant, the revolutionary. But this question will remain unanswered for a while. More importantly, it must be stated that – be it revolution or insurrection – the revolutionary theorisation of the future society, i.e. of utopia (without any connotations) is worth nothing without action in the present, or is taking strength away from action in the present. In the 70s, when the eventuality of a revolution was a little more credible (although perhaps this was only crushed into geopolitical bipolarisation), Raoul Vaneigem wrote: 'After all nothing is more urgent to those who strive [...] for widespread self-management than to intervene without hesitation or reservation against a system that doesn't destroy itself if not by destroying us at the same time.'<sup>1</sup> Today the only credible revolutionary perspective, i.e. today's only credible perspective of radical change, is that of a system that will only be destroyed if it 'destroys itself' while 'destroying us at the same time.' By 'destroys itself' I mean by means of phenomena, elements and/or reactions that pertain to it because they have been produced by it or that it has desired or foreseen. This could be the case of the system being destroyed or radically changed by a world war, ISIS, the impact of a meteorite, an epidemic, an eco-disaster, a nuclear disaster or the conquest of political power by neo-fascist groups (Salvini, CasaPound, Le Pen, Trump, Golden Dawn, British nationalists, German neo-nazis, etc.). In any case the so-called Movement, the forces working for revolution in a socialist sense – even if the word is out of date and no longer used in its historical sense – would have no role to play, as these forces would be incomparably scarce in the face of any of the elements mentioned. To hold on to the illusion that the opposite is true is one of the main causes of the crystallization of the impossibility.

Alfredo Maria Bonanno seems to suggest something similar when he talks about the 'illusions of the past, which in disappearing also took with them brave willingness, engagement beyond all limits, the smell of blood and even tears of mercy.'<sup>2</sup>

However, beyond the illusory character of a revolutionary hypothesis in a traditional sense, Vaneigem was clear: if one wants to create an other world (of self-management) it is necessary to destroy this one first. In addition to this, the factual death – other than in revolutionary militants' dreams and utopias – of a traditional revolutionary hypothesis must not also be the death of courage, courage which would no longer be revolutionary but simply insurrectional. At this point the historical fact and the preferred horizon mentioned above join together. We can't make the revolution, even if we wanted to, and the only possible radical change will come from causes that are extraneous to us, although such change would still be preferable to the existent. A catastrophe, for example, could put an end to the techno-industrial system. In any case, even assuming we were able to make a revolution, an insurrection would be preferable.

As we said, revolution is a radical change. Beyond its being radical, it is first and foremost change. It is political change. Change does not only imply the destruction of the existing order, like insurrection, but also the substitution of the old order with another, one society with another society. But as any society is authoritarian by nature, an anarchist revolution is not possible.

A Marxist, Leninist, Stalinist, Maoist revolution was perfectly possible and coherent in other historical periods: the imposition, arms in hand, so in a radical way, of an order, that of State capitalism, to take the place of a previous order, that of free market capitalism. On the contrary an anarchist revolution would always bring authoritarian results; so, unlike a Marxist revolution, it would be a contradiction in terms.

Alfredo Cospito rejects the idea of revolution thus: 'I don't aspire to any future 'paradisiac' socialist alchemy, I do not put my faith in any social class; my revolt without revolution is individual, existential, totalizing, absolute, armed.'<sup>3</sup> A clear distinction between revolution and insurrection is also made by Max Stirner, very well as always.

In order to be different from the current one, a future society would have to be based on principles established by the revolutionaries. As soon as the revolution is over, the ex-revolutionaries would have to ensure that these values were applied. Of course such values and such a society would have enemies because, luckily, there are and I hope there always will be (the victory of the here and now against the totalitarianism of all authorities!), enemies of whatever existing order, as Renzo Novatore said, including himself among them. There will always be passionate lovers of chaos. So the ex-revolutionaries will establish an ex-revolutionary police. And as there will also be external enemies until the revolution becomes global, an ex-revolutionary army will also be implemented. But once these enemies of the revolution are identified, what to do with them? Here the ex-revolutionary prisons arise. And what if some enemy of the revolution was considered to be unaware of their being an enemy? Why not to take the chance to build – or rather reopen! – ex-revolutionary mental asylums too?

In short the revolutionary society, albeit anarchist in its initial proclamations, would become exactly like the society that exists today. When I say 'exactly like' I am not referring to measurements taken with some libertarian thermometer. The degree of libertarianism in a revolution is a swindle. If the germ of authority still exists, even if not identified in words such as authoritarianism, absolutism, etc., there will be authority and there will not be freedom. Freedom is either total or doesn't exist. One cannot consider oneself free simply because one is a little less a slave. A tiger is either free in the jungle or is a prisoner in a circus or a zoo. The question of whether or not the captive tiger is held in chains concerns the torture inflicted by authority, it has nothing to do with its being free. If you are in a cage you are not free. And if you are chained up in that cage and the chains are taken off, it doesn't make your cage an anarchist cage.

Some examples of that are Makhnovist Ukraine and the Spain of the civil war. In the first case, just to mention a few of the horrors of the past, the Makhnovists were opposed to Maria Grigor'evna Nikiforova continuing to carry out direct action against authority even after the revolution of the Bolsheviks, allies of Makhno and Aršinov (notwithstanding a few quarrels concerning the chains of the caged tiger). In Spain on the other hand, under the domination of the Iberian Anarchist Federation (F.A.I.) and the Confederación Nacional del Trabajo – Asociación Internacional de los Trabajadores (C.N.T.-A.I.T.), amidst anarchist-ministers and other gems of History, the death penalty was imposed even on the production line. 4

The historical impossibility of a socialist revolution and the disgust that an enemy of every form of

authority feels towards the revolutionary hypothesis and the idea of a revolutionary society, don't in any way imply that the courage to attack authority, the enemy, has to die along with the revolution. On the contrary, it is politics that must die along with the revolution, the practice of begging for consensus in order to govern the polis. But in the absence of a polis or a society to be managed, politics would have no reason to be. After a deliberate reformulation of authority (revolution), why stop fighting?

The struggle is here and now. Victory is here and now. For our victory is the defeat of the enemy's desire for social peace. It is the gesture of rebellion, fire, destruction, annihilation, a wound inflicted on the world's morality, iconoclastic, the flames that start off from any one of the points of the technological monster. Because any authority's reason for being is the ability to guarantee itself, to exercise authority. The very existence of a cry that denies every authority, of active nihilism armed against this open air prison, therefore, is the greatest victory, here and now, that one can desire. Because the existence of subversion implies the defeat of dominion's will to be total.

For order is not order if someone, be they even just one, the only one, rejoices, mad, in the Total War, in the night of chaos!

1. R. Vaneigem, *Terrorismo o rivoluzione*, Edizioni Anarchismo, Trieste, 2015, p. 11.
2. A.M. Bonanno, Nota introduttiva, in R. Vaneigem, op. cit., p. 5.
3. A. Cospito, in *Croce Nera Anarchica*, issue 0, 2014.
4. H.M. Enzensberger, *La breve estate dell'anarchia. Vita e morte di Buenaventura Durruti*, Feltrinelli. dine, 2.5.16, *Insurrezione o rivoluzione?*

*(Publisher's notes: The reason I published this text is because it makes some points I agree with, regarding revolution but also the historical realizations, apart from that I am not involved in ideological debates between ideas which from their root need zealots to exist and survive. Insurrection for me concerns the person and never detaches from its wholeness, otherwise in the way politics and freedom is seen in the above text a political bloc centered on an ideologeme of negation, like the one of "destruction of the existent" arises and presents itself as anti-political, whereas it uses its own form of politics in order to achieve "total freedom". Or morality in order to stand "true" in front of an ideologeme of negation. In this ideology (as in every one) the person remains a prisoner.)*





## ***THE UNIQUE ONE MEETS THE OVERHUMAN II***

Zarathustra attacks individual humans for what they are, how they live, what they value, and what they aspire to become. They are disparaged because they do not fit the spiritual ideal of the overhuman.

He announces the death of god, but does not attack the supernal and mystical expressions of human thought because he knew it would destroy any notion of the supernatural dignity of humanity as the precursor of the overhuman. He wants to resuscitate the supernatural and the mystical so that the overhuman is greeted with awe and admiration. As a supernatural and mystical being, the overhuman dominates the passions and lesser values. The overhuman forms his or her own character *ab novo*, valuing creativity above all else.

The overhuman accepts that life is hard, that injustice occurs, but chooses to live without resentment or any form of pettiness. The overhuman is not motivated by everyday commerce, the necessity of meeting everyday needs, but by the opportunity for greatness and nobility.

The overhuman is the alternative to both god and humanity. Unlike god, the overhuman is not perfect. Unlike humanity, the overhuman embraces perfection as a life-goal. The overhuman struggles for perfection in a world without inherent meaning and without absolute standards. There is no meaning in life except the meaning that persons give their life. There are no standards other than those people create. Most humans – the last humans – settle for petty values and do not attempt to surpass the mediocrity and cowardice of modern life. To raise themselves above meaninglessness, mediocrity, and cowardice they must cease being merely human, all too human.

They must be harsh on themselves and each other. They must be disciplined to endure deprivation with joy. They must become creators instead of remaining mere creatures. Nietzsche says that suffering strengthens people and prepares them to overcome mediocrity and cowardice.

Harshness, suffering, and discipline are important because there is no other way to prove one's worth or to transcend modern values.

The death of god is an opportunity, not a lament, because a world without god demands that humans transcend themselves. Perfectibility or improvement is the task of the overhuman made possible and necessary by the death of god. The overhuman demands more of self than human beings.

The overhuman welcomes difficulties and duties in contrast to humans who demand nothing special, who seek only comfort and satiation, and fail to push themselves toward perfection. The overhuman accepts the risks, terrors, and deprivations inherent in living, but values life without hesitation. The existence and vocation of the overhuman is dangerous.

Danger reveals the destiny of persons; those who accept and confront danger transcend humanity and modernity, those who refuse to confront it are condemned to extinction.

Other archetypes of "modern man" are equally problematic in Nietzsche's concept of the

overhuman. Those who idolize the protection and security provided by the state, those who idolize acquisition and consumption, and those who refuse to challenge the Christian ideal of humanity are “worms,” “mere animals,” “mechanical robots;” collectively, they are a “herd.” Nietzsche’s criticism of modernity is a protest against the weakness, complacency, and fake civility of Christian humanism because it imposes a distorted image of what human beings can be. He demands the transcendence of humanity and modernity that will negate the entirety of Christian humanitarianism. Modern human beings must be transcended by the overhuman. The only hope is that the “higher men,” those humans who can still despise themselves, as Nietzsche did during his walks along the Italian Riviera, will recognize the need for a transcendence, and assist the being who can impose some meaning on the purposeless existence of humanity.

The “humanity” that Stirner targeted was rooted in Christianity, but it was not a Christian idea; it was the atheist idea of Feuerbach and Bauer. Stirner’s conflict was not with modernity as a catalog of human failures and inadequacies, it was a fight with modernity as a social system that dispossesses persons of power and property, a culture and ideology that infuse the world with spooks, and a form of cognition and everyday behavior that converts persons into ragamuffins who welcome their dispossession.

The unique one is not the overhuman and does not transcend the human. The unique one is the practicing egoist, the individual human being who owns his or her life, thoughts, and actions.

There is no external, overarching purpose for humans. There is no external, overarching meaning. Purpose and meaning are created, destroyed, recreated, and ignored by persons continually. Nietzsche is bothered by the death of god and the lack of inherent meaning in life. He wants it recreated in the form of a new being and a new morality. For Stirner, god was not dead but resurrected as humanity. Humanity is the supreme being of modernity.

Stirner objects to the imposition of meaning and purpose by culture and social institutions. Individuals can determine for themselves what matters in their lives. They can appropriate and consume what they find meaningful. Self-liberation is not a matter of discovering prefabricated meaning or waiting for the overhuman to provide it. Perfection and improvement are not measures of liberation, they are external images of how people should live, think, and behave. Ownness is a quality or the act of determining for oneself what images one will use to live; dialectical egoism is the philosophy of living without external measures of value, meaning, or purpose.

It challenges the notion that harshness is better than gentleness, that duty is better than choice, that necessity is better than freedom, that perfection is better than imperfection. Stirner did not seek a new morality, a new spiritual ideal, nor a new, improved version of human collectivities. He did not disparage persons; he disparaged social systems, the state, and “the dominion of mind” for what they do to persons. Stirner rejected all supernal and mystical essences. In *The Ego and Its Own*, humanity is a “spook.”

The overhuman is also a spook.

**JOHN F. WELSH**



## Moments of war

Scotland, Edinburgh, 22/12/2015:

At night of the 22/12 I sabotaged 3 ATMs in the wider area of Edinburgh. I used polyurethane foam to block all entrances and exits. This material expands and becomes solid after some time. In this way I attack the walls of my civilized existence. Wildness doesn't exist in the ghost of Nature. The only thing that exists in something idealistic as this is the alienation of the civilized. Wildness doesn't have a face, it manifests by the breaching of systematization. The attack doesn't become effective when we confine ourselves in rigid binaries. The separation Nature – Civilization is evenly civilized. The intangible civilization is even more underhanded than the material one. When anti-civilization is seen only as insurrection against technology and defense of the sacred Nature then it is myopic and a product of societal alienation and not conscious choice.

This sabotage is the externalization of misanthropic feelings. Directed at those that will find in the morning a freezing of their normality even for a few hours and they will judge the perpetrator. The mass is putrid and maybe even more repugnant than those who dominate now, because either they complain cause their ghost of Justice is not satisfied or they just have become automatons of society. Through the mass the master exists, there is no other way. So in this context, with those who are on side of the oppressed I have nothing to say. With everybody else whichever their approach might be, if they haven't been consumed by a new morality or other chains of the ego, I might have to say enough.

This sabotage is against society and the chains of intangible civilization. Against the ethos of prescribing of speech and action of either a way of thinking of internalization or compulsory rigid internationalization and homogenized purposes of some who make the chains of their culture ideology. The most important part of civilization is its pillars which are no other than the things that have been inscribed in each one of us. To oppose whichever dominant civilization with another still maintains remnants of society. Culture follows its own morals, customs and traditions. It is essentially opposed to the individuality. Individualities are not those who are bound with ideas, but only with their egos. The ego is the only essence that can oppose state, society and civilization. Its diversity is infinite. It has no sacred, no master, no morality. It is the first step towards the complete destruction of the existent.

Actions unfortunately do not speak on their own and the perception needs to be deep like each ones abyss. I know that with this action of mine I don't change anything that I hate but I change things inside me. It is the

outburst inside my own abyss and the responsibility claim inside isolation. Inside the insignificance of existence the only meaningful moments are these that an ego or conscious individualities create for themselves. Anything else is a product for consumption. In my opinion those who consciously fight against the existent never need an excuse to seek coordination and act. They don't wait for right times, or have the need of the remembrance of specific events to act. I greet the comrades Panagiotis Argyrou and Nikos Romanos who made the call for a Black December from Greece.

Heading towards nothing...

*Cell of anarchist and nihilist conscience "Falcon Of Chaos"*

### **Toulouse, France: Incendiary attack against Vinci trucks**

Toulouse Saturday 27th February

We set fire to several trucks on a Vinci construction site.

We wanted to kick start a fire.

To have fun together,

to not go where we were expected.

It was great.

A fire in winter is warming.

Support to all the crusty kids, zadists or not

*Some rascals*

### **"10 FEBRUARY: LIBERATION OF MINK FROM FARM IN SCORZE' (VE)**

WE VISITED THIS FARM HAVING READ THE NEWS OF THOSE WHO CAME BEFORE US. WE DIDN'T KNOW WHAT WAS WAITING FOR US BUT THE BIG SURPRISE WAS IN DISCOVERING THAT THE PLACE WAS NOT ONLY FULL OF ANIMALS BUT IT WAS ENLARGED. \_\_\_\_\_ HAD PUT ALARMS, LIGHTS, A SIREN AND A DOG WHO WAS RATHER ROUGH AND "INCORRUPTIBLE" AT OUR TREATS. THE FARMER HAD CONTINUOUS PATROLS AT NIGHT AND, NOT SO CONFIDENT OF ITS PROTECTIONS, SLEPT IN THE CAR, BUT WITH A HEAVY SLEEP ... WE WAITED FOR THE NIGHT: BLACK AND COLD. WE PASSED THE FIRST SENSORS ... AND DESTROYED THE ALARM BEFORE IT COULD MAKE ITS UNPLEASANT ANNOUNCEMENT. WE THEN DESTROYED THE ALARM CONTROLS. WE MADE SURE THAT WE HAD AN ESCAPE ROUTE AND THEN STARTED TO PULL DOWN TENS OF METERS OF FENCE, AND OPENED THE GATES. FINALLY WE OPENED ALL THE CAGES IN THREE SHEDS: THOUSANDS OF MINKS CAME RUNNING FROM ALL SIDES, WHITE DOTS IN THE DARK NIGHT. BEFORE LEAVING THROUGH THE FIELDS WE TOOK A LAST LOOK AND SAW A COMPLETELY DIFFERENT PLACE. A MESSAGE WAS WRITTEN ON A STRUCTURE: FARM CLOSED ALF.

RUNNING IN THE DARK AND COLD NIGHT A THOUGHT CROSSED MY MIND: THAT EVERY PLACE OF EXPLOITATION AND DEATH MUST CLOSE TO PUT AN END TO THE ETERNAL ANIMAL TREBLINKAL, BUT THIS WON'T HAPPEN BY ITSELF AND WE WILL NOT STAND BY WATCHING....

ANGER TURNS INTO WILLINGNESS TO ACT TO PUT AN END TO ALL THIS.

FOR DIRECT ACTION

ALF

*March 15, 2016 - Ireland*

"An anonymous call this morning from ALF activists reported that all of 80 circus signs for Belly Wein/Renz circus were destroyed in Granard over the past days.

This action was economic sabotage against this Circus who use and abuse animals for profit, the Elephant drowned in the Renz video was also mentioned. They did the action to hasten the end this Circus and other Circuses who use animals as slaves."

### **Athens: Claim of responsibility for arson attack against 2 churches**

We believe that no particular reason is necessary to accompany a destructive action of manifestation of hate and anger against one of the most timeless oppressive mechanisms that the human flock created with ulterior motive to convert it to a warranty of security and stability. Besides, how could the centuries of oppression, punishment, guilt, disgrace and enforcement be castigated and intently analyzed in only one claim of responsibility text? We would need many volumes of books to cover in the minimum a demonstration of this degeneration of existence, which is religion, that has always been the crucible of weakness, resignation, terror, decay and distortion, staining shamelessly through its own paradox, the life and its glorifiers, spreading everywhere the germ of guilt against the future and contributing in the creation of amputated believers who are ready to kneel down before every preacher of truth and adore the lashing of sin.

Through this brief approach, anyone can understand the religion's part of contribution in the establishment of authoritative societies and the mass life that is evolving in the daily life rut of insecure septicaemic people, who are unshackled from their own personal will and passion, who are condemned to carry the burden of the sacred ideal that was introduced by the divine exemplar as an undeniable logic which in the sequel constitutes the womb of the contemporary scientific doctrines.. Furthermore, the important contribution of every religion in the engendering of vanity and apathy just couldn't stay in obscurity, since the divine substance that is being displayed from the religious people as a one-way street could flourish strictly in circumstances of assignation and representation. Therefore, the aggression against the religion's structures is an indefeasible part of the overall war we are carrying against the existing system. A war with the consequences that many comrades, scattered both in time and place, have faced and are still facing.. Some of these comrades are Monica Caballero and Fransisco Solar, who were convicted because of the bomb attacks against the cathedral of El Pilar in Zaragoza. Wanting to express our complicity with the imprisoned comrades, in the context of the international call for solidarity, we broke the windows and set on fire these two churches:

-The monastery of All Saints in Kallithea

-The monastery of Saint Basil in Exarchia

To draw this text to a close, we will use a quote of the comrade Fransisco Solar, which we believe expresses the motives of our action:

"We are iconoclasts. Hence, I believe that in this effort we have to be consistent. We are not the saviours of anything nor anyone. If we clash with authority it's because we want to abolish it from our lives and not because we hope that a paradise will emerge from the debris of power. The thing that belongs to us is the complete negation of the existing

system and what this system offers is a mystery. This is what motivates us.”

### **Toulouse, France: Police station attacked with Molotovs**

On the night of Tuesday 26th [April], we attacked a police station with Molotov cocktails.

We won't lie to you any longer.

We've had enough.

Fed up of being sold that “it'll be better tomorrow”.

Fed up of waiting for the social movement.

Fed up with the dreary and sad “see you next week”.

Fed up of the spectacle of dissent where fear sinks into our stomachs and resignation into our heads.

Fed up of watching on the internet “there where it kicks off” or to masturbate over the clashes filmed and posted on youtube.

Fed up of going 600km for a riot.

We'd call it a new sport. Or even worse. A new craftsmanship.

Professional rioters of the social movements.

Looks cool on an activist CV.

Fed up of just throwing two cans, or putting a bin in the road and getting gassed, counting as a victory.

Fed up of pretending to be happy when nothing's happening.

Fed up of pretending that we agree.

Fed up of pretending that we give a shit about the El-Khomri law.

We didn't wait for the indignant 2.0 to spend some Up All Nights.

Have to say it how it is.

We are impatient.

We don't understand why we should schedule an appointment with Power to challenge it, surrounded by ever more uniforms and cop-pacifists.

We did this for the pleasure.

We did this to mark a rupture.

Because we are happy and angry at the same time.

We no longer want to be there where we are expected.

We want to send a double combative hug.

First to Mónica and Francisco in Spain.

Next to comrades from Brussels who are also experiencing repression for terrorism.

Our solidarity is attack, our crime is freedom.

See you soon.

### **Edinburgh, Scotland**

On 8/3/16 at night I set fire to a car using firelighters under the fuel tank. Wandering at night one can also create the very pleasant moments of meeting many interesting individualities that prefer the dark like foxes and raccoons. This action is an action of self fulfillment and a challenge of boosting my capabilities. Whoever wonders what kind of car was it and if it was worth the effort is a prisoner of the social and civilized swarm. Of the political necro-sickly conscience of those self-imprisoned in ideological dungeons. The neighborhoods of the peaceable citizens with the signs of the neighborhood watch are very disturbing to me as symbols of self-repression of the rationalist society and it was my pleasure to disturb one of them. The ghost of the Law everywhere around me deadens every will and worst of all even every thought of someone to defy it. It converts every lobotomized humanoid into its worthy servant without questioning. The rottenness of the systematic quietness becomes a knife in the throat of the conscious anarchist individuality trying to crush its free flow of life. Its will to become something else. Though the one who defies this situation stabs the reification of life and expropriates moments from the repeated procedures of civilisation tearing down the sepsis of normality.

On the 7/4/16 I attacked a van of the city council by slashing the tires and vandalizing its logo and its writings. As I was heading there I came across accidentally a van of a construction company of which tires were also slashed. Thereafter during the same night I headed towards some garage/storages of the city council where the signs and writings were vandalized with nihilistic symbols which did not aim at becoming idols but signify the transition through attack. These actions happened during the Edinburgh international science festival which took place this period, of which the above targets were major financial providers, filling the prison city with the propaganda of the ideology of science, of the most contemporary religion which as "godly speech" has classified and claimed everything around us. Made as a product easily inside the capitalist reality of annihilation of producing personal thought to fit in every culture where everyone can receive a part of it as so to remind to the faithful of the ghost of Progress that the future is in good hands as long as they leave themselves in the armful of this deity. Leaving outside the horrific parts which treat life as trash because they would repulse the future believers and inspirators of their pathetic social evolution. Also with endless events that promote the green development, ideologicalized captivity, objectification and spectacularization of the non human animals and the earthly environment as well as the human subjects themselves who reproduce these logics being imprisoned in the dungeons of their ideologically and rationally constructed realities. Though I do not excuse them. In the question "did the ghosts make them or did they make the ghosts?" I answer that there is a mutual relation between the two. The enthusiasts of "human essentiality" for so many years have tried to save this sacred that from its pedestal arise so many whips and chains as well as others who have found in this "essence" the source of the ghost of Evil they always vomit prophecies. I am beyond this contemptible idiocy. Against every mass leprosy but also against the herds that drag it.

Strength to my comrade from the cell Anti-Surveillance Front / Incendiary Nomad Cell / F.A.I. as well as to my comrades who from far away conspire with whatever they have for the personal anarchist war.

For the beauty of self-realization and the rise of the self over every authority.

For the rise of the unique individualities and the war for their own.

Death to Science.

Death to every civilisation.

**Mexico: Incendiary-explosive attack on a delegation of Automotriz**

*"We are not afraid of burning cars because we carry a new world on our bikes"*

*"The indiscriminate burning of vehicles is a very popular method that we would address in person to the public opinion, we do not deny that it is a very effective method to draw their attention. The "Breakers" (destroyers) swoop down on the root of the society of consumption: the car, vehicle of narcissism, indicator of success, erotic fantasy and exaltation of sexual power".*

-Gavroche, The revolt of the suburbs.

*"The youths burning cars have captured everything about society. They don't burn them because they can't get them: they burn them so they don't need to desire them".*

-Frédéric Beigbeder.

Today, April 26, 2016, approximately between 3:00 and 3:30 am, while the stinking masses of slaves fill their batteries in their homes to get up early to work, while many people dream of saving money to buy luxuries and to rise in the social pyramid, we poured our venom in one of the most widespread and accepted symbols within the techno-industrial, and modern capitalist society: the car.

We take responsibility for the arson-explosive attack which took place at dawn against a car dealership of Automotriz company on the avenue Lopez Portillo in Coacalco in Mexico State. The fire hit 5-7 new vans, causing serious damage, plus the firing of an explosive device that caused further damage in that branch. These attacks, of course, they look rather playful than "revolutionary", since there is no need to say that the "social revolution" is something that we care in the slightest, and that the programs, parties, organizations, the catechisms and other garbage of the left cannot cause us something other than boredom and nausea.

We want nothing, we demand nothing, we don't protest or make demands, we prefer the attack, violent strike, looting, sabotage, spoof, fun, game.

We want to contribute to the trivialization of violence, because it seems necessary that the attack on the enemy is not done in terms of "militarization", of professionalism, specialization, nor be measured and dosed in detail, nor limited to specific dates, as in the case of red guerrilla and / or organizations of "social" struggle, but to consist of informal actions, ordinary, playful, vandal, easily accessible from any sick and mad spirit who is anxious to destroy everything around it. We no more dream changing the existent, it's enough for us to see it burn, to hear it explode.

In war against the existent!

War against ourselves!

PS: Ha - Ha!

*Cell Child green, Child blue.*





## **Philadelphia, USA: Attack on a construction site as part of the month for the Earth and against Capital**

Everywhere the wild is pushing back against civilization. Even in the cities, wildness flourishes in forgotten places, slowly widening the cracks in this civilized order.

On a warm spring night, we went to a construction site where there was once a wild and abandoned place. We did what we could to hinder the progress that has befallen that area: removing survey stakes and dividers, stealing and destroying pieces of what was being built, and smashing the machines that homogenize and commodify the land.

We don't know what they intend to build on the site and we don't care. Any domestication of wild places infuriates us.

We took this action as a contribution to the month for the earth and against capital.

Philadelphia

Spring 2016

## **Athens: Responsibility claim for torching of ELTA vehicles in Agioi Anargyroi**

At the time when human zombies nourish their survival with social norms and semblance pushed from the legitimacy of authority, in essence legalizing miserable life, the conflict with the latter automatically marks the opening of a field of dialectic with the feelings of the living. Boredom knocks on the door of all of us and we try to transform it into negation. We are exactly where the waiting for a mass uprising tires, where the appetite for destruction of this rotten world identifies with our enjoyment.

At daybreak of 27/5 we burned two vehicles of ELTA in Agioi Anargyroi.

With this action we send minimum strength to CCF, who are on trial for the escape plan and other matters, as well as other anarchists involved in them.

Let's become more dangerous for authority.

*Exponents of the creative nothing / commando Mauricio Morales*

*Informal Anarchist Federation / International Revolutionary Front (FAI / FRI)*

## **Athens, Greece: Cars torched in Kolonaki for Black July**

On June 22nd 2016 the German police bastards once again raided the Rigaer 94 squat after the whole Nordkiez area had been declared a 'danger zone' with permanent controls and police presence. However they have failed to contain the conflict in this corner of Berlin.

As anarchists we cannot sit idly by before the onslaught of the authorities against individuals or structures with whom we share common desires of revolt and destruction of the existent, whether in Berlin, Athens or anywhere.

However we believe that we shouldn't limit outbreaks of anarchic violence to defensive reactions against attacks by the authorities (evictions, arrests, etc). We must be the ones who go on the offensive, with all available means, without waiting for an attack to respond. We have plenty of reasons to always attack and to attack first.

In the Nordkiez conflict has been constant, but in many other cases the existence of squats and other 'movement' structures has been an excuse to maintain the status quo and postpone the attack. The best thing that can happen with these places is 'self-eviction', if this involves the rupture of normality and the liberation of the conflict within the city.

On the night of July 5, as a gesture of complicity with Rigaer 94, and within the framework of the call for a Black July, we took a stroll in Kolonaki (a posh area in the center of Athens) and began indiscriminately burning cars with the intention of the fire spreading uncontrollably to as many vehicles as possible. And because there is always a reason to satisfy our destructive appetites.

For us the indiscriminate burning of cars is one of the many forms of direct attack against civilization and the society of servile slaves, the function of these machines is of utmost importance to the chain of production and consumption. Their main role is to transport people to work or to the places of consumption and alienating 'leisure', they also symbolize social status and personal success in the mentality of the citizen-consumer masses.

FOR THE SPREAD OF HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE AUTHORITIES!

SOLIDARITY MEANS ATTACK!

*Chaotic behavior in constant revolt – FAI/ELF*

**August 2, 2016 - UK**

CROW LIBERATED, TRAP TRASHED, SNARES REMOVED

"Crow liberated from Larson trap in UK

Larson trap trashed

9 snares removed"



**July 30, 2016 - USA**

ENCLOSURES DAMAGED AT ZOO, OWL FREED

According to local media reports, during the night of July 22-23 exhibits and enclosures were damaged at the Bear Hollow Zoo in Athens, Georgia. Viewing windows were broken, locks, fencing and aviary netting was cut, and "Free the Animals" and other animal liberation messages were painted.

The damage allowed several animals to escape from their enclosures. One week after the incident, a screech owl had not been recaptured.

## Poetry of the void



*Oh inquisitors be gentle, for I shall repent!*

Eternal bane.

Galloping on the open wound of humanity.

Priests and rhetorecians offer me their medicine.

They want to cure me of my disease.

The misanthropic egoism.

### *My trepidation*

Birds, you who in the skies move,

share something with me,

don't leave me alone with the humans,

give me a glimpse of your experiences.

### *Neverending nothing*

Through the shadows which I walk,

I see my reflection being lit by an unworldly light.



The voracious ghosts are summoning me to fulfill their desires,

they and their priests call me "coward" lest they initiate me to the Truth.

But I like to reside in the shadows, the light of the righteous ones is what I hate,  
the elitists of every kind I will see one by one to fall from the throne.

My creation is mine, my destruction is mine,  
at will I desecrate everything if so I desire.

### ***Barathrum arise!***

The odour of the wind covers me,  
my misanthropic silence the most perpetual war,  
devouring the shadow of existence,  
as grandiose ethereal rawness.

### ***Against everyone***

Don't speak to me no more,  
I've gone deaf from the truth,  
don't speak to me no more,  
I've been recruited by your reality,  
don't speak to me no more,  
maggots of bullshit!

### ***Shadow. Fire. Life.***

From above I look at the fires,  
if I'm not part of them then they don't belong to me,  
with all my being I eviscerate the ideologicalized fear,  
I become the death of the coward and the hero.

### ***...of obscure might***

My path is dark,  
I don't have and never have I ever had light,



I'm not interested in my corpse to be given as sacrifice,  
only to be scattered as ashes from high mountaintops.

***On the cliffs of night let us seek power***

Breezy darkness, abrupt light,  
strain of the steepness of the forest,  
magnificent silence, acclaimed voice,  
the eye of existence opens and closes.

***Despair***

Despair,  
accursed beauty,  
gate of the road of emptiness,  
tormentor of mind and flesh.  
Despair,  
ethereal touch of barbarity,  
groping of demolished mountains,  
trenchant blade of the senses.  
Despair,  
fountain of high knowledge,  
grotto of the most deep introspection,  
climax of the exploration of power.  
Despair,  
coffin and throne,  
life and death,  
axe of the storm.

***Terrifying beauty of old***

As I was ascending the mountaintops I was  
reflecting,  
where are the other animals, what became of  
them?



where are the eagles, the bears, where is the wolf?  
but I forgot, the naive one, the sterilized land I live in.



### *The unique one*

A thorn is the sprout,  
that grows without fertilizers,  
something unpredictable and strange to the eye,  
a thing that the ones who see the unknown as beauty,  
will respect, approach, fumble,  
something that those of whom their senses have mortified,  
will fear, burn, trample on,  
the herd passes trampling not creating.

### *Onward...*

My eyes are open seeing wavy forms,  
the sea of sound the opening of the gate,  
darkness emits light,  
its shadow worships me.

Am I the poet, or the poet is me?

Watching from outside I find myself inside,  
and when I'm inside I am definitely outside,

and the space opens for a mark in the trap door of existence.



With the railments of night I will go across,  
the birth of nothing is inevitable,  
with the axe of reality I chop my blood,  
the grave has only bones it doesn't have spirit.

## ***Introduction to the project Antisocial Evolution***

Starting with the introduction to this blog it has to be said that there will be no spectacularized commodification of its contents so as to make them products for adoption and justify its existence. Its existence stands on values of persons and not of ideologies. Inside the capitalist alienation of commodification of personalities and ideas the anarchist speech that intends to deconstruct all systems needs to be carefully used in its expression as not to fall into the trap of offering yet another product of civilisation. By diving into the deepest pits of our own being we unfold chaotic flashes which seek to affirm life against control, the machines of the technological sewer and the compromised communication of the internet as well as to defy and desecrate the abstractions of the Law. We believe there are many individual positions on anarchy and generally perceptions that are not being communicated because of the lack of a certain culture, a product of civilization. But this is exactly what we want to destroy. The standards that make alienation defying personal thinking and acting to be impossible but instead it has to step on certain foundations to unfold. To go beyond a reified use of language, to destroy and create with personal content annihilating all abstractions of civilised systematization which are products of societal domination and thus seek to unchain the plurality of chaos. Most important is to say that this experimentation is not here to "enlighten" anyone about how they "should" act and why. There have been many idealists in anarchist thinking of which whoever wants to buy hope or something to grasp on for the breach of their existential void can read. There are also many manicheans who reek of a sense of duty for those who like a sense of belonging. This experiment belongs to no fictional tendency nor will it try imperatively to raise one with the danger of creating a product for the sterilized consumers of the epoch of utmost depersonalization but instead it will aim at creating egoistic bonds which don't have role models or a known outcome, between individual egos voluntarily away from the imaginary bonds-roles that are created within reactive to society contexts of resistance. This doesn't mean that the ones who write these lines are an "elite" or some kind of specialists in anything, on the contrary this comes from someones who want to experiment more in theory and practise with total liberation as a tool of the persons and never the persons in the service of idealistic causes that acquire the form of universal significance. Therefore we are not advocates of the ideologeme of the "destruction of the existent", the pillar of political ideological nihilism that raised itself as an unavoidable reaction to the failed management of the exact same sacred values, using a construct named Anarchy as a castle to which the anarchist as a role has given himself according to "its" needs. When your unique content is crushed under forms of explicit knowledge ideology becomes you unavoidably.

We are against morality and we see ideology as a basic obstacle for realizing ones uniqueness, as well as both of them as basic pillars for the institutionalization of control, roles of society and systems that strengthen and perpetuate civilisation. We see morality as systems of sanctified values that demand compliance, according to the ideological image that anyone has constructed inside their minds and show the "right path". Not all forms of morality are extremely condemning whereas some others are. It can come from anyone, it is not connected to certain -isms, in fact it has nothing to do with terms. It is always connected to the way of thinking but most importantly to where the way of thinking originates from and how it unfolds. First of all if we don't have real personal values coming from how we experience life but reified ideas as values, whether they imply universality or not doesn't matter, we automatically speak of morality. Any idea, construct of the mind which is uplifted as more real than the one who values it, is an ideological conscience and this is not the conscience of the person but of an Idea with a predefined content, which consequently will bring morality because this idea was never seen as a choice, but as a truth. As the "right path" and sometimes the "only path". There is where politics enthrones itself. We do not belong to any political ideologies. We belong to ourselves. The ideologeme of Anarchy vs Authority creates only new authority over the self, a "temporary" internalized authority until it "permanently" destroys "all authority". The minds of idealists create new constructs and new roles, but anarchy for us is not this, we see reality in the physical existence as constituted by unique beings who massify themselves when consumed by ideology and moralistic causes, who most of all demand soldiers and sacrifice for the Idea. This is the major problem for everyone. Reification. By using a certain word, a certain role, which contains "essence" in itself, the "common cause" is created and then the person, the self sacrifices his own cause on the altar of abstractions. We see all ideologies as chains, whether it takes the name



of Anarchy or something from its very nature ideological as Democracy for instance. Even nihilism, everything can become an ideology, we might share common perceptions with some whereas with others nothing, but we will never become part of any of them. Our desire is not to meet and collaborate with Humans or any other construct out of the numerous out there but insurrected persons creating anarchy free of social residues which is mental and corporeal and will never become "perfect". This blog has no relation to the scattered promiscuous solidarity which is a characteristic of a plethora of anarchist political circles, as it is against politics and humanistic nature imperatives of Principles for the realization of imaginary revolutionary alienations and movements. We don't see ourselves through any human belonging and we perceive the authentic relations as coming very differently in comparison to the intoxicated of the civilised social inebriation. We aim at accommodating nihilistic perspectives and actions that affirm life, insofar as they don't collide with our own egoistic values, with purpose the beautiful self-realization of the directly lived experience, psychologically and corporeally. There is no aim at becoming an internet anarchist newspaper but only experimentation.

Within reactive social contexts arises the creation of an essentialized identity defined by something "other". This subject has established a logic of reaction, it cannot go beyond to strive for individual self-definition, create his own content and fight according to what defines him uniquely and not in conjunction to an identity content that is a link to what is being opposed, a link to society. The will to power is a way of going beyond any social context to perceive society for its clear nature, that of various non-existent unities consolidated under ideologemes of belonging which create roles and internalized duties and can only be realized through ideological consciences, any systematic dualistic axiological prefixes that constitute morality instead of a personal ethics, the things that bring to life a mass mentality which can even be present in circles of few people. There is the need for egoistic self determination and pursuing of personal desires beyond terms, roles, titles, identities that give an "essential" substance to their "subject". For this reason someone remains a subject of reified ideas and not an individual self who uses the language as a tool infusing it with ones own content and thus trying to attack the barriers of civilisation and the essentialist constructs of society at the same time diving into the chaos of the first spark of significance in existence. The ego which is not a new construct but only the as much as possible self-defined away from civilised alienation individual self. A person left with choices according to her conscience, not with one or two choices, but with as many as she can perceive and conquer. A person who answers to no one, not necessarily literally in the physical reality since mass powers are always physically stronger than the individual, but with his contempt for all who try to show specified paths he stands mentally autonomous, unaffected and unprejudiced following a non-path according to his own destructive-creative desires.

To destroy any dualism of moralism between a personal ethics and desire one has to follow the path of his own experiences by never detaching what is perceived and valued from the person who perceives it keeping simultaneously away from absoluteness that cultural standards create which can easily be followed by a subjective idealistic formation of the ghost of Truth. As such the person remains always as the source of understanding and action keeping what tacit knowledge has helped him to unfold his ego and discard anything that subconscious reactive instinct showed the person that in the long run suppressed her, because of decisions that didn't help her enjoy being in the world as part of ones own conquered relations from nothing and perspective into chaotic existence but instead they were manifestations of internalized pain. These analyses come from lived experience. This is not a suppression of desire but its unchained form from any alienation, since from a point of view of a not fixed "nature" unconsciousness could be seen as reactive behavior coming from suppressive events. The person is still internally suppressing the self. In such a way can personal values be created that are only seen as tools in the service of the egoist individuality and never the other way. Values can only be there to serve the ego to fulfill his desires and never suppress those in their name. Although these are interconnected and this is a very complex matter that can never take a "pure" form because it always has to do with different situations including others that you might or not care about. This way values are created and destroyed by the nihilist at will, never becoming sanctities that the person will be sacrificed to their cause. If values become consciences of their own they start demanding, they create a universal significance and easily become morality. The same way desire can become a reified value. Also whoever denies that all experience and knowledge coming from it creates values falls into the trap of moralism himself trying to "cleanse" himself from them and creating the morality of anti-ethics. There are two types of morality that can be developed within nihilist theories and by recognizing the following it is possible to crush them more easily. One arises when someone denies completely all values thus placing into the same category a personal ethics with morality. The second arises by the one who will create an anti-reality of Negation (an idealistic construct), thus turning the negation into a Cause and a whip. In the first situation is maintained the perception



that every value is a carrier of morality obfuscating the person to deny knowledge and experiences which are without doubt starting point for values, thus juggling into a denial of life, living as such death internally. In the second case negation has become a cause of universal significance, either internalized or not, turning it into the exact "opposite" from whichever dominant values that constitute morality in society and as such making negation another morality since it enters a dualistic dialectic by promoting specific values as products. An amoralist practise and perception of life seeks to go beyond any imposed dualism and roam into the chaos of life by destroying and creating, understanding the reality outside the person as a part of it but never ideologicalize it so as to subordinate the ego to it. So never accepting domination and confusing it with relations of power. Trying to understand deeper the aspects of civilisation, realizing that the perception comes from a personal perspective which is also connected to the external reality and not attempting to present anything as something it is not only to attack it easier within ideologicalized contexts. The amoralist sees no purism, she goes through despair and pleasure, through defeat and victory. Amorality is only about conscious freedom of choices and an explanation coming from only deep personal content not bound in the command of ideas, it isn't confined in binaries, imperatively finite choices or solutions nor does it justify the action because an idea says so.

So denying to adopt whichever "side" and political ideology to regulate ones life with the enlightenment that possesses each one of them with their imperatives means to free oneself from any chains of duties and stand as an autonomous wholeness. If the priests start yelling "curmudgeons! surly cowards! intellectuals!" the answer is that the powerful one is not the soldier, without his faith, stripped he would collapse. The powerful one is he who doesn't have the slightest sacred ideal, naked from any armor of faith and yet still revels and embraces the void attacking every sham that tries to rise over him. The acceptance of insignificance would be the harshest realization even for the bravest and for this reason it is avoided at all costs. The extirpation of the person from every faith that operates as regulator of existential emptiness should be combated? Is the acceptance of insignificance the weakness or the faith? The one who accepts insignificance and quits for this reason is still a faithful because helpless to eradicate the faith in the significance of ghosts falls into mourning for their abandonment. She doesn't keep fighting by accepting insignificance as a joyful moment of rejection of faith as chains of the mind. Though the iconoclast has abandoned any faith in ideas external from her lang syne. From such a point of view significant could be seen only the direct experience, mental and corporeal, of the person of whom experience turns into a tool for the maximizing of uniqueness and self-realization and their extraction from every sham which poisons the will of the individuality.

Many are afraid of being alone, of being left with nothing but their own thoughts and a physical existence which they do not know how to interpret. This is why when nihilism strikes they try to cast it out like the snake who bites and spreads poisons inside their healthy ideologically built worlds. Idealism destroys life. It places the beauty of it, therefore we are referring to its unchained flow into boxes of perfection and mind dependent reality. We are not of those who pray to the Abyss to stay there because creation is "worthless" neither of those who create castles recruiting soldiers confining oneself into his own reified contents and enslaving others to their "cause". We are beyond any mass approach that can be developed through reified ideological constructions that can even be maintained by few. Nihilism, a tool of the profane devastation of inscribed structures, predetermined perceptions from ideas and unquestionable values, takes the reality in which you live and mashes it without stopping to perceive it. But it is the eternal fall that annihilates all idealism and its products leaving you in a death twitch and new unfound beauty, where you struggle within the limits between pleasure and stabbing of your own self. This fall has no ending but also no return. We are anarchists but we understand anarchy as a means of realizing our desires and not as a political objective cause that binds us to roles/duties which reproduce new "essentialities" like the anarchist as the new Human perpetuating the slavery of humanism and thus not rejecting society from its roots for the institutionalisation it produces. Those who don't realize that every system is a chain will always bring new authority over the person no matter how they name it. We distinguish relations of power from relations of domination, seeing the first as an inextricable part of the affirmation of life in existence, whereas the second as crystalized relations coming from authoritarian ideas.

Anything that will be posted here is in no case completely representative of ours but something that we see useful for expropriation, including sounds which fully expropriated from reified contexts and cultural representations unfold the beauty of sound creativity to be used as our own.

After the extirpation of idealism, manichean radicalism, revolutionism and the imaginary construct of Justice no matter its mantle all that remains is choices and the obliteration of civilization's mindset.

We dedicate these words to those who don't belong anywhere!

*Antisocial Evolution*

<https://antisocialevolution.blackblogs.org/>

[antisocialevolution@espiv.net](mailto:antisocialevolution@espiv.net)



## *On Being Lyrical*

Why can't we stay closed up inside ourselves? Why do we chase after expression and form, trying to deliver ourselves of our precious contents or "meanings," desperately attempting to organize what is after all a rebellious and chaotic process? Wouldn't it be more creative simply to surrender to our inner fluidity without any intention of objectifying it, intimately and voluptuously soaking in our own inner turmoil and struggle? Then we would feel with much richer intensity the whole inner growth of spiritual experience. All kinds of insights would blend and flourish in a fertile effervescence. A sensation of actuality and spiritual content would be born, like the rise of a wave or a musical phrase. To be full of one's self, not in the sense of pride, but of enrichment, to be tormented by a sense of inner infinity, means to live so intensely that you feel you are about to die of life. Such a feeling is so rare and strange that we would live it out with shouts. I feel I could die of life, and I ask myself if it makes any sense to look for an explanation. When your entire spiritual past vibrates inside you with a supreme tension, when a sense of total presence resurrects buried experiences and you lose your normal rhythm, then, from the heights of life, you are caught by death without the fear which normally accompanies it. It is a feeling similar to that experienced by lovers on the heights of happiness, when they have a passing but intense intimation of death or when a Premonition of betrayal haunts their budding love.

Only a few can endure such experiences to the end. There is always a serious danger in repressing something which requires objectification, in locking up explosive energy, because there comes a moment when one cannot restrain such overwhelming power. And then the fall is from too much plenitude. There are experiences and obsessions one cannot live with. Salvation lies in confessing them. The terrifying experience of death, when preserved in consciousness, becomes ruinous. If you talk about death, you save part of your self. But at the same time, something of your real self dies, because objectified meanings lose the actuality they have in consciousness. This is why lyricism represents a dispersion of subjectivity; it is a certain quantity of an individual's spiritual effervescence which cannot be contained and needs constant expression. To be lyrical means you cannot stay closed up inside yourself. The need to externalize is the more intense, the more the lyricism is interiorized, profound, and concentrated. Why is the suffering or loving man lyrical? Because such states, although different in nature and orientation, spring up from the deepest and most intimate part of our being, from the substantial center of subjectivity, as from a radiation zone. One becomes lyrical when one's life beats to an essential rhythm and the experience is so intense that it synthesizes the entire meaning of one's personality. What is unique and specific in us is then realized in a form so expressive that the individual rises onto a universal plane. The deepest subjective experiences are also the most universal, because through them one reaches the original source of life. True interiorization leads to a universality inaccessible to those who remain on the periphery. The vulgar interpretation of universality calls it a phenomenon of quantitative expansion rather than a qualitatively rich containment. Such an interpretation sees lyricism as a peripheral and inferior phenomenon, the product of spiritual inconsistency, failing to notice that the lyrical resources of subjectivity show remarkable freshness and depth. There are people who become lyrical only at crucial moments in their life; some only in the throes of death, when their entire past suddenly appears before them and hits them with the force of a waterfall. Many become lyrical after some decisively critical experience, when the turmoil of their inner being reaches paroxysm. Thus people who are normally inclined toward objectivity and impersonality, strangers both to themselves and to reality, once they become prisoners of love, experience feelings which actualize all their personal resources. The fact that almost everybody writes poetry when in love proves that the resources of conceptual thinking are too poor to express their inner infinity; inner lyricism finds adequate objectification only through fluid, irrational material. The experience of suffering is a similar case. You never suspected what lay hidden in yourself and in the world, you were living contentedly at the periphery of things, when suddenly those feelings of suffering which are second only to death itself take hold of you and transport you into a region of infinite complexity, where your subjectivity tosses about in a maelstrom. To be lyrical from suffering means to achieve that inner purification in which wounds cease to be mere outer manifestations without deep complications and begin to participate in the essence of your being. The lyricism of suffering is a song of the blood, the flesh, and the nerves. True suffering begins in illness. Almost all illnesses have lyrical virtues. Only those who vegetate in a scandalous insensitivity remain impersonal when ill, and thus miss that deepening of the personality brought about by illness. One does not become lyrical except after a total organic affliction. Accidental lyricism has its source in external factors; once they have disappeared, their inner correspondent also disappears. There is no authentic lyricism without a grain of interior madness. It is significant that the beginnings of all mental psychoses are marked by a lyrical phase during which

all the usual barriers and limits disappear, giving way to an inner drunkenness of the most fertile, creative kind. This explains the poetic productivity characteristic of the first phases of psychoses. Consequently, madness could be seen as a sort of paroxysm of lyricism. For this reason, we should rather write in praise of lyricism than in praise of folly. The lyrical state is a state beyond forms and systems. A sudden fluidity melts all the elements of our inner life in one fell swoop, and creates a full and intense rhythm, an ideal convergence. Compared to the refined culture of sclerotic forms and frames, which mask everything, the lyrical mode is utterly barbarian in its expression. Its value resides precisely in its savage quality: it is only blood, sincerity, and fire.

**E. M. Cioran: *On the Heights of Despair***

### *Contents*

- Prologue – Desecration of universality and the theatrical significance of civilisation's performances (pages 2-5)
- Chaotic iconoclasm and incineration of idols (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 1) (pages 6-9)
- The coronation of moralism upon the throne of the ghost of Nature (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 2) (pages 9-19)
- Breaking the windows that sell the products of civilisation (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 3) (pages 20-21)
- My misanthropism (Anticivilisation paroxysm part 4) (pages 21-23)
- Wildness in the city (pages 24-28)
- A Life (pages 28-31)
- Insurrection or revolution? (pages 32-35)
- The unique one meets the overhuman II (pages 36-37)
- Moments of war (pages 38-45)
- Poetry of the void (pages 46-49)
- Introduction to the project Antisocial Evolution (pages 50-53)
- On being lyrical (pages 54-55)

